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Abstract

The Government of Lao PDR is committed to using tourism to promote sustainable economic development. It’s approach is to encourage independent travellers to pioneer new patterns, then to assist local communities to participate in enterprise around these patterns.

New Zealand has been assisting with this strategy ever since the Nam Ha Ecotourism Project in Luang Namtha from 1997-2008. Most recently, the Community-Based Tourism for Sustainable Economic Development (CBT-SED) Project ran from April 2011 to March 2014 with a total budget of USD$3,466,030. The project was implemented in 4 provinces - Khammouane, Xieng Khouang, Bolikhamxay and Luang Namtha. Funding was channelled to the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism (MICT) and MICT led implementation.

A review of the CBT-SED project in February 2014 found that by funding a government programme, the project had harnessed a large part of MICT toward the project goals. In this respect, the project had succeeded spectacularly well. MICT and MFAT have an easy, open and mutually respectful partnership. The Project has achieved many useful outcomes, including significant new infrastructure such as the Plain of Jars Visitor Centre in Xieng Khouang.

The review recommended proceeding with a design that: builds commercial sustainability by encouraging the private sector to participate; leverages on New Zealand’s comparative advantage in tourism; takes a destination management approach; and demonstrates how Laos’ core strategy of following independent travellers can drive the growth of substantial, mainstream tourism as it has in New Zealand.
Executive Summary

**Background and context of the Activity**

The Lao Government recognises tourism’s role in making positive contributions to poverty reduction and national social and economic development in its National Socio-Economic Development Plan.

The CBT-SED activity has built on the relationships and experience that New Zealand gained in past projects in the tourism sector with the Lao Government and the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism (MICT).

The three-year CBT-SED activity was implemented in four provinces - Khammouane, Xieng Khouang, Bolikhamxay and Luang Namtha. The activity was designed to scale up the success of the community based eco-tourism project at Nam Ha in Luang Namtha province and elsewhere.

The goal of the CBT-SED activity was to promote economic growth. The activity aimed to build the capacity of provincial Departments of Information Culture and Tourism (DICTs), to implement the National Tourism Strategy and contribute to the development of community based tourism and value chain improvements.

Activities included construction of small scale tourism infrastructure (e.g. tourism information centres, accommodation lodges, national community-based tourism training centre), entrepreneurship training for local people, the development of tourism site management plans and provincial tourism strategies, and the production of brochures, guidebooks, promotional videos, touch-screen kiosks, and a hotel and guesthouse classification programme.

MICT, was the executing agency.

**Purpose and objectives of the evaluation**

The evaluation assignment comprised two phases.

*Phase I: Review of the CBT-SED.* The goal of the CBT-SED activity review was to examine activities to date, identify lessons learned, assess objectives, results and impacts of the CBT-SED intervention, and make recommendations to MFAT on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

*Phase II: Design of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector.* The goal of Phase II was to develop an Activity Design Document for the implementation of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector.
sector. This new phase of support will have an indicative length of five years and an indicative budget of NZ$5m.

The scope for the design was presented in a Draft Review Report on 14 March 2014. The decision to proceed to design was MFAT’s.

Methodology

The review work began with desk research. Briefings with MFAT officials in Wellington and Bangkok helped the reviewer to understand current attitudes and opinions in the NZ Aid Programme.

Initial briefing meetings with the MICT and PCU were followed by interviews with stakeholder groups and individuals in Vientiane. A programme of project site visits was then undertaken. The reviewer was accompanied throughout the site visits by the CBT-SED Programme Director, who is also Deputy Director of Tourism Development Department in MICT, and other officials from the PCU.

All four provinces were visited. In each case the PIU made a presentation on the CBT-SED programme’s activities in the province, the outputs and outcomes.

After the field work, a debriefing meeting was held in Bangkok with MFAT officials responsible for overseeing the programme. The officials shared their opinions and gave advice on proper review procedures.

A draft review report was then compiled and circulated within MFAT. Comments from MFAT officials were consolidated. Agreed changes were incorporated in this revised final review report.

Key findings and conclusions

Highly relevant to Lao’s pro-poor development agenda, the project has attracted large percentages of senior officials’ time. The effect has been to transform MICT and the concerned DICTs. They are now motivated and equipped with CBT development skills and experience.

The project implementation modality was influenced by ADB and it works very well.

The Lao Government’s commitment reflects the same rationale that is behind the New Zealand Aid Programme’s special focus on tourism in SE Asia – i.e. there is considerable empirical evidence within the developing countries of Asia that tourism can help drive development in remote rural areas.

From New Zealand’s perspective, tangible outcomes are needed in terms of lasting impacts on the development of tourism. The jury is still out on whether such impacts will occur.
The CBT-SED could be made more relevant to the NZ Aid Programme’s priorities in Asia if it were to build closer partnerships with the private sector tourism industry of Laos.

Much more relevance for New Zealand’s aid priorities could also be achieved by refocusing on Lao’s original aim of tourism sector growth.

Further proof of Laos’ commitment to CBT is that MICT is currently working with ADB on a new $40 million support project based on the exactly the same agenda.

DICT officials in three of the four target provinces reported that their provincial governors are now “seeing the point” and taking CBT seriously. Unfortunately, in some places, CBT has come to be viewed as an alternative to the large-scale private sector investments being pushed by the Governor.

The destination management approach favoured by ADB is useful. New Zealand has more flexibility as a donor and could, if MICT agreed, also support private sector contributions in other ways.

The CBT-SED has developed an impressive array of innovative new products. The Nam Ha model has been spread throughout the four provinces. Valuable lessons have been learned along the way.

The results-based approach that MFAT has been advocating has been adopted by MICT.

A red flag should be placed around the degree to which MICT and DICTs are becoming an all encompassing solution to CBT. Provincial governors could be asked to play a role in ensuring that other parts of government also start aligning.

An impressive array of CBT products has been developed. For the most part, the CBT-SED supported facilities and products have a good chance of making a lasting contribution to tourism.

As they stand, many CBT-SED products will struggle to be sustainable. The information centres and visitor centres in particular have a very Western flavour. Countries throughout Asia that have attempted to import these same Western models have found many of their markets are simply not attuned to visiting somewhere first to get information before going to an attraction. The advent of GPS has added to this problem.

The Training Centre in Luang Namtha is an excellent facility. The answer for the sustainability of the Training Centre is likely to be
engagement with the whole tourism sector, not just CBT aimed at European markets.

Many of the significant gains made by the CBT-SED to date will need ongoing help to be sustainable. In general, this will be best achieved by engaging the tourism industry in partnerships.

If the CBT-SED approach is to continue there needs to be adjustments. There are now seeds of disenchantment about CBT. Critics suggest it is is self-limiting.

**Summary of lessons learned and recommendations**

Lessons learned included that the partnership between government and communities around CBT works well to empower communities.

The Lao Government is genuine in its wish to drive economic development through tourism.

Returning to Laos’ “Following the FITs” strategy for developing tourism is the key. This means not being content with budget FITs, but instead monitoring the patterns FITs are pioneering, then engaging with the industry to drive markets upwards.

This vision is best achieved through destination management rather than focusing only on individual products. Dialogue with provincial governors is required to reengage CBT with mainstream economic development.

Other government agencies should be aligned. More can be made of the other mandates within the MICT.

The private sector could help MICT to implement part of a future project. The private sector could also be asked to help CBT products make linkages to markets.

The CBT-SED information and visitor centres will need help to be viable. There is strong enthusiasm in Lao PDR for leveraging on New Zealand’s comparative advantages as a donor in tourism.

The review recommends that MFAT proceeds to design a new project that builds on the well-established and constructive partnership of MICT and MFAT and addresses the lesson learned from the CBT-SED.
Background and context of the Activity

Tourism is the second most important economic sector (after the livestock industry) in Lao PDR and it is expanding. The CBT-SED project activity is intended to promote economic growth and reduce poverty in the four focus provinces of Lao PDR by building the capacity of provincial tourist departments to implement the National Tourism Strategy and contribute to the development of community based tourism and value chain improvements.

Purpose, scope and objectives of the review

Purpose and scope

This review is part 1 of an assignment with two phases:

Phase I: Review of the CBT-SED

The goal of the CBT-SED activity review was to examine CBT-SED activities to date, identify lessons learned, assess objectives, results and impacts of the CBT-SED intervention, and make recommendations to MFAT on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

The results of the review will be disseminated to the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and the Lao Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism (MICT) and used to inform MFAT and MICT on the direction of any further assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

Phase II: Design of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector

The goal of Phase II will be to develop an Activity Design Document for the implementation of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector. This new phase of support will have an indicative length of five years and an indicative budget of NZ$5m.

The decision to proceed to Phase II was made by MFAT based on a draft review submitted on 14 March 2004. The scope for the design was developed as part of Phase I: Review (see Objective 7 below) and finalised and agreed to by MFAT prior to Phase II proceeding.

The time period covered by the review was 1 April 2011 - December 2013. The geographic focus was the four target provinces of the CBT-
SED programme including Luang Namtha, Xieng Khouang, Bolikhamxay and Khammouane. The target groups were; i) Project Coordination Unit (PCU) at the national level from the Department of Tourism Development under the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism in Vientiane; ii) Project Implementation Units (PIUs) at the provincial level from Tourism Divisions under the Departments of Information, Culture and Tourism (DICTs) of the four provinces iii) private sector (e.g. travel agents, tourist product entrepreneurs); iv) selected villages and community members. Senior officials from the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, provincial governors, other donors to the tourism sector (e.g. ADB, SDC, JICA, SNV) and MFAT’s International Development Group were also consulted.

**Objectives and review questions**

The objectives of the review and the review questions were:

**Objective 1:** to assess the *relevance* of the CBT-SED programme
- To what extent does the activity continue to be relevant to beneficiaries, the New Zealand Aid Programme and partner country development priorities?
- To what extent have the benefits from the activity addressed the needs of the different groups of stakeholders?
- To what extent is the programme approach (community based tourism) relevant and appropriate to the context of the Lao tourism sector? Are there other approaches that are now more appropriate?

**Objective 2:** to assess the *effectiveness* of the CBT-SED programme
- To what extent have intended outcomes of the Activity been equitably achieved as a result of the activity?
- What unintended outcomes (positive and negative) have occurred as a result of the activity?
- What has constrained or enhanced the achievement of outcomes?
- How have the different risks and challenges that have emerged during the implementation of the project been managed?

**Objective 3:** to assess the *efficiency* of the CBT-SED programme
- Have resources been used in the best areas, and in the best possible way, in order to provide value for money?
- What is the quality of partner and MFAT management (e.g., activity planning, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and risk management)?
• Is the activity well coordinated with other development support provided to the Lao tourism sector?

Objective 4: to assess the sustainability of the CBT-SED programme
• What is the likelihood of continued long-term benefits after the activity has been completed?
• To what extent does the activity promote local ownership and develop local capacity?

Objective 5: to assess the impact of the CBT-SED programme
• What positive and negative impacts have resulted to date and are likely to result from the activity after it is completed?
• What would have happened without the activity?

Objective 6: to assess the extent to which cross cutting issues have been addressed by the CBT-SED programme
• To what extent does the activity identify and promote gender equality and women’s empowerment?
• To what extent does the activity protect and promote human rights?
• To what extent does the activity protect the environment and manage environmental impacts and risks?

Objective 7: to make recommendations on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.
• How has the operating context (Lao tourism sector, local development needs, partner development plans and NZ development objectives) changed since the CBT-SED activity was designed, and how should these changes influence future New Zealand assistance?
• What specific areas, sub-sectors and/or approaches should future New Zealand assistance target?
• Outline a proposed goal, key outcomes and indicative outputs in the format of a Results Diagram.
• Discuss the possible implementation arrangements for the new activity (e.g. the respective roles of key stakeholders – central and provincial government, private sector etc.)?
• What lessons learned from the existing activity can be incorporated in the new activity?

Objective 8: to prepare an Activity Design Document – subject to MFAT approval to proceed - based on agreed recommendations and scope.
Methodology

The review work began with desk research to understand the context and background. Briefings with MFAT officials in Wellington and Bangkok helped the reviewer to understand current attitudes and opinions in the NZ Aid Programme.

Initial briefing meetings with the MICT and PCU were followed by interviews with stakeholder groups and individuals in Vientiane. A programme of project site visits was then undertaken. The reviewer was accompanied throughout the site visits by the CBT-SED Programme Director, who is also Deputy Director of Tourism Development Department in MICT, and other officials from the PCU.

The reviewer’s Terms of Reference are attached as Appendix A. The Review Plan is attached as Appendix B. A list of interviewees is attached as Appendix C. The reviewer’s field work programme is attached as Appendix D.

All four provinces were visited. In each case the PIU made a presentation on the CBT-SED programme’s activities in the province, the outputs and outcomes. After first listening to the presentation, the reviewer asked questions around:

- Perceptions of value around the objectives, results and impact of the CBT-SED programme?
- relevance of the programme?
- efficiency of the programme?
- effectiveness of the programme?
- mitigating factors involved?
- sustainability of the programme outcomes?
- impacts and cross cutting issues?

The reviewer attempted to form judgements quickly so that findings and likely directions of the review could be shared with the CBT-SED Programme Director and other stakeholders. This enabled the reviewer to gauge reactions from stakeholders to review judgements and to seek buy-in to possible new directions.

Throughout the field work the reviewer maintained a dialogue with the MICT officials around the questions:

- Is an extension to the programme justifiable?
- What new directions should be taken in future support to tourism in Lao PDR?
- What should be in the terms of reference for the design of a new phase of support?
- What are the challenges likely to be involved and ways to overcome them?

In most cases the reviewer was able to ask questions of the officials after the site visits around outcomes and impacts of activities. Attention was paid to how project activities are contributing to the Lao government’s agenda of using CBT as a tool for sustainable economic development. Occasionally questions were able to be directed at community stakeholders aimed at seeking clarification on the impacts of the project on communities.

After the field work, a debriefing meeting was held in Bangkok with MFAT officials responsible for overseeing the programme. The reviewer shared his views on the technical aspects and discussed New Zealand’s motives for engaging with the Lao tourism sector. The officials shared their opinions and gave advice on proper review procedures.

The reviewer compared MFAT’s perceptions with the views of MICT / PICT personnel, other project stakeholders and observers of the programme. The reviewer also researched the history of New Zealand’s association with Lao tourism, investigated the forthcoming ADB tourism support project likely to run concurrently with any future project, then answered MFAT’s review questions. When judging effectiveness and efficiency the reviewer relied on comparisons with other projects of a similar nature, including previous NZ Aid Programme tourism projects in Asia.

A draft review report was then compiled and circulated within MFAT. Comments from MFAT officials were consolidated. Agreed changes were incorporated in this revised final review report.

**Limitations of the review (and the effect of these on the evaluation)**

MFAT has been actively monitoring this project and the project has consistently achieved its implementation targets. MICT has taken strong ownership. There is an easy, open and mutually respectful relationship between MFAT’s overseers in Bangkok and MICT’s project implementers in Vientiane. Because of this, the reviewer was able to concentrate on the project’s motives, rather than on counting what had been achieved. Knowing there may be a design phase, the reviewer frequently questioned the rationale behind project activities.

The review programme was constrained by time limits and the fact that project activities are spread over a wide geographic area. It was only possible to visit a sample of activities and to interview a sample of stakeholders. Some associated private tourism operators were talked to and a few tourists. No attempt was made at systematic assessments of impacts - for example impacts on the wider communities, within the tourism industry or amongst Lao PDR’s
tourist markets. In these areas the reviewer relied on experience with similar projects and on many useful comments from observers.

Findings and Conclusions

Objective 1: to assess the relevance of the CBT-SED programme

To what extent does the activity continue to be relevant to beneficiaries, the New Zealand Aid Programme and partner country development priorities?

Relevance to Lao’s pro-poor development agenda

Supporting pro-poor tourism development was central to the NZ Aid Programme’s original motivations for engaging with the Lao tourism sector. Lao’s National Tourism Strategy (NTS) and National Ecotourism Strategy and Action Plan (NES&AP) had articulate strategies for developing styles of tourism that can benefit poor rural communities. MFAT’s previous Country Strategy for Lao PDR (2006-2010) signalled New Zealand’s interest. The Lao Government requested New Zealand’s assistance in three areas:

a) to assist the work of implementing the NES&AP on a trial basis in four provinces;

b) to assist in capacity building for the government tourism agencies at Vientiane level and in a select number of provinces;

c) to assist the preparation of a Tourism Development Plan for Xiengkhouang Province, an area of growing importance and the location of a proposed World Heritage Site.

The project that resulted has unquestionably succeeded in helping to concentrate the work of Lao’s primary government tourism development authority on pro-poor styles of tourist. During the three years of the CBT-SED project, approximately 50 percent of the working time of the MICT’s Deputy Director of Tourism Development Department (CBT-SED Programme Director) has been focused on CBT-SED activities. Almost 100 percent of MICT’s Director of Ecotourism Division (CBT-SED Programme Manager) has gone to CBT-SED activities. About 25 percent of the work of the staff of three MICT Departments (Tourism Development, Tourism Marketing and Tourism Management) has been devoted to the project. Similarly, at provincial level, between 80 and 100 percent of the work of the DICT offices in the four target provinces has been devoted to project activities.
This level of commitment by a government agency to an externally funded tourism development project is highly unusual. This is the reason why the CBT-SED project has been able to achieve so much. The approach of “funding at the programme level” has effectively harnessed a large part of a government agency toward the project goals. This aspect of the CBT-SED has worked spectacularly well.

An ADB-funded project, the Mekong Tourism Development Project (MTDP), supported exactly similar activities in six other provinces of Lao PDR. That project also focused the attention of other senior MICT officers and harnessed the work of the DICT offices in those provinces towards CBT.

The overall effect of the two projects has been to transform MICT and the concerned DICTs. They are now highly motivated and well equipped with CBT development skills and experience. The MICT and, to varying degrees, the concerned DICTs appear motivated and committed to implementing CBT activities.

Building the capacity within MICT to implement CBT was central to the aims of the project and also to ADB’s Mekong Tourism Development Project. From the viewpoint of MICT officials, both of these projects were about spreading the CBT methods developed from the previous (NZ-funded / UNESCO overseen / MICT implemented) Nam Ha Ecotourism Project in Luang Namtha, which the Lao Government counted as very successful.

Village-level authorities find the government’s attention and support to CBT highly relevant. Village leaders insist that government activities funded by the project have enabled their villages to engage in income generating activities, thus assisting otherwise impoverished communities. Most villages reported a growing community tourism fund. Although none reported expenditure from the fund, most said it would one day be used to support further expansion of CBT.

Relevance to NZ Aid Programme’s priorities

The CBT-SED project was scoped out at a time (2006) when the focus of the New Zealand Aid Programme was on improving policies and procedures around the delivery of aid. Whereas in the past, New Zealand had provided funds for ecotourism projects in Lao PDR (the Nam Ha Ecotourism project in Luang Namtha and others in Xieng Khouang), the CBT-SED was conceived as a high-level, long-term engagement in line with MFAT’s strategy for improving aid effectiveness by supporting fewer, bigger, deeper and longer...
relationships. This approach reflected New Zealand’s wish to be more than an arms-length donor.

The intention was to support the Lao Government’s desire to build its capacity to facilitate pro-poor tourism growth. Uniquely, CBT-SED was conceived as funding at the programme level, rather than funding for a project. By agreeing to support the CBT-SED, New Zealand recognised a temporary need to boost the tourism sector into appropriate and sustainable patterns of growth. At the Lao Government’s request, New Zealand agreed to a strategic focus on four provinces, including the two where New Zealand had past tourism project experience.

It was originally envisaged that technical assistance would be required in the early stages for planning and design of pro-poor initiatives and to facilitate the establishment of the Lao PDR / New Zealand partnership. As the programme developed and advantages of the partnership became evident, it was envisioned that other opportunities might arise for technical assistance that exploited these advantages.

As it turned out, much of the technical assistance element was removed during the design stage. The end result was a project funded by New Zealand and more or less entirely driven by Lao tourism officials. This has worked spectacularly well as a means to getting things done. An efficient team at Vientiane level (PCU) contained experienced and largely effective people as in-house technical support. Other locally-based technical support, also experienced and effective, were called in from time to time.

At provincial level, PIU officials were largely left to their own devices to organise themselves, with occasional technical support from the PCU. The result of this has been that PIUs developed strong ownership and commitment to the CBT-SED programme. All have achieved impressive outcomes of one type or another.

During its design stage (2007 - 2008), the CBT-SED was heavily influenced by the fact that the Lao Government was at the same time in dialogue with ADB around its parallel project in six other provinces. The term “community based tourism” came from the dialogue with ADB. The mechanics of the CBT-SED implementation also echoed an ADB-style of project delivery (PCU and PIU’s, etc). The MICT has wholehearted adopted this project modality. It has become a mainstay of the Lao pro-poor tourism agenda.

Just as those donor-led influences left a legacy, so too have MFAT’s priorities had an influence. MFAT’s oversight of the project (2011 –
2013) spanned a period of on-going change within MFAT. The New Zealand Aid Programme’s priorities had recently moved from a community development focus to a sustainable economic development focus. In Asia, this was reflected in MFAT’s Flagships for engagement with ASEAN that showed a harder edge towards delivery of aid with emphasis on tangible results. Throughout, MFAT has remained process-driven. Its processes are now directed towards tracking results.

Lao tourism also went through significant transformations during the project. The LNTA became the MICT. However, Lao’s policies remained consistent and committed to pro-poor tourism. This commitment reflects the same rationale that is behind the New Zealand Aid Programme’s special focus on tourism in SE Asia – i.e. there is considerable empirical evidence within the developing countries of Asia that tourism can help drive development in remote rural areas. Lao policies are built around using tourism in this manner.

As to whether the CBT-SED project as it stands remains relevant to New Zealand’s focus on tangible development outcomes, the situation is less clear. MFAT’s project overseers have introduced a results framework approach designed to sharpen the focus on outcomes. This has been folded into MICT’s approach to pro-poor tourism. It is now respected as a sensible approach to ensuring development efforts produce real results.

However, the project remains as it was designed, reflecting an ADB agenda of funding to support government’s implementation of CBT. From ADB’s perspective, CBT is the software wrapped around an infrastructure-led approach to development. From New Zealand’s perspective, tangible outcomes are needed in terms of lasting impacts on the overall development of tourism. The jury is still out on whether such impacts will occur.

Lessons learned from the history of New Zealand assistance to tourism in Asia is that the best results occur when an active private sector is aligned with a supportive and well-focused government tourism development agenda. Tourism projects of all types succeed best when the tourism industry is fully engaged and aligned with government around pursuing growth. Community based tourism works best when convergences of interests occur between communities, government and tourism’s private sector.

The CBT-SED could be more relevant to the NZ Aid Programme’s priorities in Asia if it were to build closer partnerships with the private sector tourism industry of Laos. Much more relevance for New
Zealand’s aid priorities could be achieved by refocusing the CBT-SED on the original aim of the tourism growth sector.

Relevance to Lao PDR’s current development agenda

The Lao Government, through MICT, remains resolutely committed to spreading CBT. There is no doubt that CBT-SED has become relevant to MICT. In fact, CBT is almost all-consuming within MICT. An excellent measure of MICT’s commitment is the reported efforts by MICT and the PICT offices in the seven provinces that have no tourism support projects to implement selected CBT development techniques using MICT’s own financial resources. (Of the seventeen provinces of Laos, the CBT-SED is active in four, ADB is supporting tourism projects in six and seven have no support).

Further investigation of these efforts by MICT in the other seven provinces will be undertaken during the design phase in order to assess their effectiveness and to investigate opportunities for New Zealand support of those efforts in selected ways in order to support the wider CBT promotion agenda. MICT’s use of CBT methods in other provinces is proof of outcome for the CBT-SED and assisting this may be an effective transitional strategy for New Zealand.

Further proof of MICT’s commitment to CBT is that it is currently working with ADB on a new $40 million support project based on the exactly the same agenda. The new ADB project, titled GMS Tourism Infrastructure for Inclusive Growth Project, will again concentrate on ADB’s six target provinces in ways that are complementary to the CBT-SED.

The idea of helping MICT to engage the CBT agenda with the wider tourism industry is not in conflict with either MICT’s or ADB’s thinking. Both recognise the need to engage more widely. While it is difficult for ADB to incorporate private sector interests, its new project will introduce the idea of Destination Management Organisations (DMOs) and Destination Management Plans (DMPs), the principal reason for which is to support integration of all the component parts of tourism.

According to ADB’s preliminary design documents, the DMO/DMP component will be designed to: “... promote cooperation among public and private stakeholders in the tourism sector to sustainably develop, manage and market tourist sites and destinations.” (Draft interim Report of “Preparing the GMS Tourism Infrastructure for Inclusive Growth Project”).
New Zealand also bears some responsibility for what is a missing element in the CBT-SED project’s CBT methodology. The original design of the Nam Ha Ecotourism Project had a major component focused on engaging with national in-bound tour operators with a view to linking four or five operators with community-focused cultural trekking operations. Somehow, this element was left out in implementation. Thus, the Nam Ha project success story – at the heart of the Lao Government’s CBT agenda and of CBT-SED methods - was a story of government assisting communities. The first lessons learned were about how successful such a partnership can be. Subsequent lessons include that without the cleverness of the private sector, success only lasts while there is continued government support. This is a lesson that has been learned by CBT projects throughout the world.

The original ADB project and the CBT-SED were designed to spread “the Nam Ha model” to other provinces. ADB now recognises the need for private sector links. Both ADB and MICT also learned that product development formulae that worked in Luang Namtha do not automatically work elsewhere. This latter lesson usefully informed the CBT-SED design.

The basis of the Lao / New Zealand partnership in tourism

Continuing the historical context for a moment, New Zealand was first attracted to the Lao’s tourism development agenda because it was a tourism development approach based on a lesson that New Zealand had learned well. Rather than dismissing the “backpackers” market as of low value, it pays to follow what they are doing, because at least in Asia / Pacific, not only do they spend significantly over their whole stay, they can also serve a useful purpose to indicate the mainstream tourism patterns of the future.

This notion contrasts with the classical, widely taught European model of tourism development which is that the wealthy discover new tourism destinations and down-market elements follow on. In Asia/Pacific, many now famous tourism destinations were first discovered by the “backpackers”, or in the case of Bali, by surfers. New Zealand’s tourism leaders once dismissed “backpackers”, then discovered how useful they can be in pioneering new patterns.

Laos was essentially following this approach when it decided to allow and foster free and independent travel (FIT) within Laos, to study the resulting patterns then work out how to drive the market upwards. Lao tourism authorities at the time of Nam Ha called this the “step by step” approach. At the time it seemed well suited to Lao’s situation because the Government was unable to fund large-scale,
infrastructure-led tourism development. New Zealand understood the approach then. New Zealand’s tourism industry people still would.

**To what extent have the benefits from the activity addressed the needs of the different groups of stakeholders?**

*A Multi-faceted project*

The previous section drew attention to the history of the CBT-SED programme. From the donor side, motivations have varied over time. The project was conceived as support for a programme to build pro-poor tourism growth; it was finally designed as a project to deliver CBT development by promulgating the Nam Ha model; and it has been overscened ever since with an agenda of seeking better ways to deliver assistance to communities.

Similarly, there are variations in the motivations of Lao Government stakeholders and in the communities touched by the project. The following summarises are generalisations around these variations.

*Addressing the needs of MICT*

As outlined above, MICT’s needs were around building capacity and developing CBT methods. To this extent the project has unquestionably produced aligned benefits. MICT now has methods, skills and experience. As noted above, it is actively using and applying these in the seven other provinces. The reviewer worked with some of the senior MICT officials prior to the CBT-SED and can compare the attitudes and confidence levels within MICT and the DICTs before and after. Officials are undoubtedly more confident and feel strongly empowered.

DICT officials in three of the four target provinces reported that their provincial Governors are now “seeing the point” and taking CBT seriously. In part this can be attributed to the fact the some of the CBT achievements are perceived as making contributions to mainstream tourism, especially in Xieng Khouang, Khammouane and Bolikhamsay. Unfortunately, this dialogue also reflects a frequent disconnect between the project’s CBT agenda and what is perceived as different agendas, pushed by Governors, of mainstream tourism sector growth.

This disconnect was most noticeable in Luang Namtha where CBT is obviously viewed, at least by DICT officials, as an alternative to the large-scale private sector investments being pushed by the Governor.
The agenda of building on FIT patterns as a means to drive tourism sector growth appears to have lost its way.

Luang Namtha is also the province where private sector comments were critical of the government/community partnership’s inability to reach the standards of quality required by the private sector. Tour operators report choosing to develop their own lodges and making their own relationships with communities rather than putting up with the low standards of CBT. (The same operators who make these comments were extremely supportive of the government’s focus on helping communities to engage in tourism).

ADB’s new destination management approach is one way to overcome this problem. New Zealand has more flexibility as a donor and could, if MICT agreed, also support MICT in encouraging the private sector to contribute to CBT in other ways. At least some part of the project in future could be aimed at linking government/community CBT partnerships with the private sector, thus helping to put the missing element into the model.

Addressing the need to develop CBT in four provinces

The CBT-SED has developed an impressive array of innovative new products. Other tourism-focused aid projects typically hope to attract a small part of the government’s attention or else harbour a notion that sometime in the future government will pick up on methods demonstrated by the project. In this case the government is completely focused and completely behind the project.

The award-winning Nam Ha model has been spread throughout the CBT-SED’s four provinces. Valuable lessons have been learned along the way. The idea that a government/community partnership can achieve gains through CBT is firmly cemented. The public sector of Lao tourism is stronger and more confident. The ADB model of PCUs and PIUs has proved an effective means to deliver project results.

Addressing the need for better ways to deliver assistance to communities

The results-based approach that MFAT has been advocating has been adopted by MICT. To the extent that MICT models have influence in Lao government systems, this could make a difference within the Lao government in future.

It is hard to judge how much influence MICT and the DICTs are having on other government agencies. Indeed a red flag should be placed around the degree to which MICT and DICTs are becoming an all-encompassing solution to the CBT agenda. It is reportedly difficult
for MICT to be both efficient and at the same time involve other agencies. Time is wasted on demarkation issues. While efficiency is an important objective, on the other hand an eye should be kept on how MICT is evolving.

ADB’s influence on CBT projects in Lao came at a time in the mid 1990s when the Bank was experimenting with sector agendas leading infrastructure. All GMS projects have been in this mould. The forthcoming project is likely to be the last. Perfect in principle, the problem with this approach is that it requires tourism officials, for example, to build roads. Hence, MICT now employs roading engineers. Similarly, New Zealand’s focus on value chains has led to MICT employing agricultural experts. How far should this extend?

Throughout the world, national tourism agencies are becoming leaner and more intently focused on their primary role of destination marketing. In Laos, MICT is on a path towards becoming larger and more integrated. While this is probably entirely appropriate given the stage of Lao’s development and the importance of tourism to rural development, the question needs to be asked whether, perhaps provincial governors could be asked to play a role in ensuring that other parts of government also start aligning with the CBT agenda?

**Addressing the needs to grow Lao tourism**

The idea of the backwards (value chain) linkages of tourism has been firmly embedded in MICT. Project short-hand is “CBT villages” (villages that are being encouraged to develop tourism products) and “value chain villages” (those encouraged to make handicrafts or to grow vegetables for sale to tourists elsewhere.) This is an excellent illustration of mainstreaming community tourism development into government processes. Only a few countries in Asia (including Nepal and Vietnam) can match this wholehearted acceptance of a government role to encourage communities to engage with and benefit from tourism.

An impressive array of CBT products has been developed. In the context of developing methods, skills and experience in order to build capacity in a government agency, the project has been an outstanding success. MICT and DICT officials are empowered and their methods are clearly appreciated by community recipients.

For the most part, the CBT-SED supported facilities and products have a good chance of making a lasting contribution to tourism. Project activities in Xieng Khouang and Bolikhamxay probably have the highest chance. In both cases this is because somewhere along the line, clever decisions were made in matching products with market
demand. In Xieng Khouang, the Plain of Jars Visitor Centre is well tailored to the need to tell the various stories of the jars areas to visitors. In Bolikhamsay, there is a sense of a real connection between the tourism patterns to the area (short trips from Vientiane and temple visits from Thailand) with the CBT-SED products.

As they stand, many CBT-SED products will struggle to be sustainable in the long term. The information centres and visitor centres in particular have a very Western flavour. Countries throughout Asia that have attempted to import these same Western models have found many of their markets are simply not attuned to visiting somewhere first to get information before going to an attraction. Asian visitors, for example, would go straight to the attraction (even before GPS). If they stop first, it will be for food.

The Green Adventures office in Thakhen, Khammouane, is a model modern Asian version of a visitor information centre. It combines information with food and a place to hang out. The Japanese model of  

\textit{michi-no-eki} (roadside stations) takes this concept to a sophisticated level making the visitor centre the focus for local food, community-based products and local homestay promotions as well as a reliable place for comfort stop facilitites and information. Another Japanese concept, one village one product (OVOP) is wide-spread throughout Asia and is sometimes combined with \textit{michi-no-eki}. This is occuring for example in Thailand, where it is called one tambon one product (OTOP).

The Training Centre in Luang Namtha is an excellent facility. It too has sustainability questions. In this case, the problem is not design. The problem is that the gloss has gone off Luang Namtha (and the Ham Ha model) as the best example in Laos of CBT. There are, however, many things happening in mainstream tourism in Luang Namtha in which communities could and should participate. The answer for the sustainability of the Training Centre is likely to be engagement with the whole tourism sector, not just CBT aimed at European markets. The best use of the Luang Namtha Training Centre may be teaching Mandarin and adapting Lao cooking techniques for Chinese and Thai tastes.

Many of the significant gains made by the CBT-SED to date will need ongoing help to be sustainable. In general, this will be best achieved through refocusing on the agenda of tourism growth and by engaging the tourism industry in partnerships for growth.

\textbf{To what extent is the programme approach (community based tourism) relevant and appropriate to the context of}
the Lao tourism sector? Are there other approaches that are now more appropriate?

Relevance of CBT

The notion of a partnership between a government agency and local communities to empower and equip the communities to engage in tourism in places where tourist flows are occurring or will occur remains absolutely sound. Experiments in such processes have been occurring throughout Asia and the Pacific in various forms since the late 1990s. (It is worth noting that this is not an imported Western concept. New Zealand, for example, has hardly ever done this. “Ecotourism” was conceived in Mexico and its various derivatives, including pro-poor tourism and CBT, have largely evolved in developing countries.) Most major development agencies still have faith in their effectiveness.

Of all the countries of Asia, Lao PDR is one for which CBT is thoroughly relevant. Without the financial resources to develop tourism through an infrastructure-led manner, a bottom-up approach makes sense. The NZ Aid Programme’s alignment with this agenda was made clear in earlier documents: “Foremost among NZAID’s considerations is a keen interest in participating in the evolution of techniques to implement Lao PDR’s pro-poor tourism development agenda.” The CBT-SED project’s origins were attached to Lao’s innovative “step-by-step” approach (monitor FIT flows, intervene to equip communities to engage, then drive markets upward).

If the CBT-SED project is to continue there needs to be adjustments. There are now seeds of disenchantment about CBT within government. Luang Namtha is not hailed as the ideal model it once was. Critics in the donor community suggest CBT is self-limiting. In part, this may be the result of seeing tourism development in classical, European terms and not appreciating the “step-by-step” idea. In part also they are correct. Why should Lao tourism be forever limited to small, community-scale enterprise? This was never the intention.

As noted above, the CBT-SED is in danger of perpetuating the problem of Lao government agencies working silos by focusing all the action on MICT. The project has focused on one set of value chain linkages – back into the communities, but is not at all strong at linkages in the other direction – towards the tourism industry, where real sustainability comes from.

Hence in future, while there is every reason to keep faith with the CBT processes given the undoubted successes of the CBT-SED project
to date, there needs to be more attention to CBT as a means to grow tourism. The notion that CBT is an end in itself, or worse, an ideal alternative type best suited for Laos, should be abandoned.

Additional Relevant Approaches

If there is to be a design stage, additional approaches need to be considered:

... reach up to a strategic level at provincial level and start a dialogue with provincial governors around tourism sector growth.

... reach out to other government agencies at provincial level to align their agendas.

... reach out to the other mandates within the MICT, especially around strategic monitoring (using tourism statistics and other metrics to develop measures of tourist flows) and on the cultural side (linking tourism management and heritage site management – something New Zealand is good at.)

... reach out to the private sector to help implement parts of the project, importantly to help communities “listen to visitors” (the best way for community-based operations to sustain and grow.)

... reach out to the private sector for a contribution to continued clever and agile thinking around questions such as what products to focus on and how to link them to markets.

... channel project monitoring activities towards monitoring tourism sector growth.

... consider going with the MICT into the other seven provinces following its core agenda of using CBT methods in clever, cost-effective ways to promote wholesome tourism patterns.

... pay attention to Asian models for information and visitor centres and use the learnings from them to ensure the sustainability of facilities already built.

... consider using a tourism version of “agricultural diplomacy” – say bringing people who work at the interface between heritage management and tourism (park managers, historic places operators) and people who know how to develop natural and cultural tourism products (experienced private operators) to work alongside people in Laos doing the same role.
Objective 2: to assess the effectiveness of the CBT-SED programme

To what extent have intended outcomes of the Activity been equitably achieved as a result of the activity?

Outcomes achieved

Judging from MFAT’s monitoring of CBT-SED results and comparing those results with similar projects throughout Asia, the outcomes are remarkable and outstanding. The reviewer does not know of another tourism project in Asia, with the possible exception of the Tourism for Rural Poverty Aleviation Project (TRPAP) in Nepal, that has undertaken as many activities aimed at mainstreaming CBT within government systems.

Equitable outcomes

There is no evidence of project benefits being captured by elite groups. Almost to a fault the project has focused on achieving outcomes for poor communities. Overall, the project appears to have found a sensible balance between a desire for equity and the reality of using tourism as a tool for development, which is that only those with portable skills or portable products or direct access to tourist flows can realistically benefit. The emphasis on value chain products has provided MICT with a tool to address equity issues by spreading benefits away from the tourist flows.

What unintended outcomes (positive and negative) have occurred as a result of the activity?

CBT as a end in itself and as a self-limiting ambition for the Lao tourism sector

The project has picked up some unwanted baggage around the label CBT. In the minds of some advocates, CBT is an end in itself. Perceptions of this attitude are influencing the reputation of CBT in Laos. Voices are raised against CBT, suggesting that it is a self-limiting ambition and the income generating potential is very small.

These critics may be missing the key point, noted above, that “following the FITS” is a means to an end. Many countries of Asia Pacific, New Zealand included, have great respect for FIT markets as the pioneers of future tourism patterns. Indonesia knows well how Bali first developed and its tourism people now look for emerging FIT patterns. Lao’s own private sector operators see this point strongly
and advocate that government continues with the “following the FITS” approach.

Asia also provides good examples of what happens when this development pattern does not work and market refuse to be pushed upwards beyond the budget backpackers. Nepal tourism operators and officials continually grapple with this issue, referring to the problem as being “stuck in a low-end rut”.

**What has constrained or enhanced the achievement of outcomes?**

*Enhancements*

An overriding enhancement is the level of commitment by MICT and the four provincial DICTs. ADB also reports that Laos consistently outstrips Vietnam and Cambodia, in terms of diligence, in its GMS tourism projects. In the reviewer’s experience, few other countries in Asia can muster the same government dedication to using tourism as a development tool.

Another important enhancement is the “wholesomeness” of Lao’s tourism growth agenda. There is a deep appreciation in Laos, both in the public and in the private sector, that tourism should be steered in wholesome directions and away from unwholesome directions. (In this sense “wholesome growth” means: “sector growth in keeping with social, environmental and cultural values”.)

Concerns about wholesomeness were the reasons Laos was at first reluctant to open its borders to FITs and expose itself to the problems reported by its neighbours. When it did open its doors, the “following the FITs” idea was conceived to address this concern. Historically, many governments of the GMS and some development agencies harboured strong concerns about tourism being unwholesome.

The fact that the Lao government officials are determinedly following a guiding and controlling agenda could lead to accusations of stifling behaviour by government. The integrity of the officials in MICT, plus the encouraging influence of neighbouring GMS countries, ADB, UNESCO and bilateral donors such as New Zealand, are helping to ensure such accusations do not get levelled at MICT.

*Constraints*

An overriding constraint is that the tourism industry and other government agencies are not very engaged. In terms of producing projects outputs, this may not be a constraint at all. The PCU and PIU arrangement is efficient in getting things done. However, it is a
constraint for sustainability. Tourism everywhere grows through commercial linkages. Community sellers need private sector industry buyers (this linkage is entirely absent in some of the project products – e.g. hot springs). Community sellers improve by talking to commercial buyers (ie tour operators). Leading tourism destinations of the world manage to align the agendas of all government agencies towards the goal of tourism growth (Singapore and Thailand excel at this).

How have the different risks and challenges that have emerged during the implementation of the project been managed?

Management of Risks and Challenges

There are relatively few loose ends to this project. Implementation management has been focused and effective. There are variations from province to province in the degree of focus and the degree of effectiveness, but overall implementation has been outstanding. Oversight by MFAT has been empathetic and responsive. There seems no reason to question the implementation modality.

Objective 3: to assess the efficiency of the CBT-SED programme

Have resources been used in the best areas, and in the best possible way, in order to provide value for money?

Achievements

In terms of things achieved, the CBT-SED has been remarkably efficient. In terms of outputs per dollar, the CBT-SED has achieved as much as this reviewer has seen in any tourism project.

What is the quality of partner and MFAT management (e.g., activity planning, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and risk management)?

PCU and PIUs project implementation approach

The ADB-inspired PCU and PIU approach is working well. It creates enough separation from the day to day operations of the Ministry and Departments to foster efficiency and accountability, but it is not removed from government processes nor is it perceived as acting in parallel like many projects. Funding at the programme level and
alignment with ADB’s modality has produced a high quality implementation approach.

**Six monthly activity review and planning**

There is a routine around the six monthly review meetings that both sides of the discussion look forward to. Reporting procedures are clear and, from all accounts, adhered to. If there is to be a future for the meetings, more strategic dialogue should be introduced. The results focused framework could be around broader, strategic issues of how best to grow the tourism sector.

**Financial management**

As mentioned in the limitations section, this was not a counting review. However, it is unusual for there not to be some surfacing of concern around financial management. In this case, there was no suggestion of concern from either side, either from MFAT or from MICT.

**Risk management**

This review did not set out to uncover risk. However, some did surface. There were no apparent risks of the very serious nature that can occur in such tourism projects, such as diverting the time and attention of subsistence farmers towards risky ventures. At village-level, all the ventures seemed worth the risks and the project seemed anyway in close support.

As noted above there are reputational risks around CBT becoming a tarnished approach, around sustainability of community products without industry links and around importing Western models for visitor and information centres.

Setting off for three years with no external technical inputs was risky. Fortunately, the technical people that MICT had access to locally were competent, particularly those who helped with the Plain of Jars Visitor Centre and with all display work. Not engaging technical expertise with New Zealand connections exposed the CBT-SED to the risk of repeating mistakes made in previous NZ Aid Programme tourism projects.
Is the activity well coordinated with other development support provided to the Lao tourism sector?

Coordination with ADB

The previous ADB Project was well coordinated with the CBT-SED. It would have been even more aligned had the timing been closer. However, alignment with ABD’s modality is a mixed blessing. It tends to be focused on a regime of project targets. The CBT-SED could be more of a “programme”, with more flexibility.

In regard to ADB’s forthcoming project there will be less need to align and coordinate. The MICT has effective systems in place to run the projects in parallel, to service each and to pick lessons from each. In fact it will be healthy if there is a wider gap in approach. New Zealand funded projects can and should be more intensively focused on software.

The destination management concept is an area where it will be in MFAT’s interests to maintain close alignment with ADB as their agendas will coincide. The CBT-SED could also take other directions that will bring private sector assistance and sensibilities into play.

Coordination with Other Development Support

Reportedly there was in the past close coordination with SNV, which had a modality of supporting tourism development specialists to assist government projects. SNV has since pulled out of tourism in Asia. The project is known to GIZ and Swiss government agencies that also sponsor tourism projects, although they are diverging from a CBT focus.

The reviewer made contact (during the design mission) with the Lux Development-sponsored LANITH tourism and hospitality training project and with JICA, which also sponsors projects. Both have admired the achievements of the CBT-SED project.

Given that the CBT-SED is embedded with MICT, major coordination problems are unlikely.
Objective 4: to assess the sustainability of the CBT-SED programme

**What is the likelihood of continued long-term benefits after the activity has been completed?**

**MICT / PICT ownership**

In the opinion of the reviewer, ongoing ownership of CBT methods by MICT and the PICTs of the four provinces is highly likely.

**Sustainability of Information and Visitor Centres**

There are sustainability questions around the information and visitor centres and around the training centre in Luang Namtha.

The Plain of Jars Visitor Centre is well designed and very appropriate to the site through Western eyes, so much so that it may defy the pattern of other Asian parks and succeed against the odds. However, its odds of succeeding will be much greater if: i) it becomes the heart of an active and well respected heritage site management operation; ii) it is brought into alignment with the agendas of the private sector guides who will bring tourists there; and iii) it is integrated with a lively and interesting souvenir selling and food serving scene nearby.

The project’s “i-Site”-style information centres, just like their cousins in New Zealand, will have to contend with the reality that modern travelers have GPS. They do not go somewhere first for information then visit an attraction. Rather, their GPS takes them straight to the attraction and other devices give them the information they need. Perhaps the project’s information centres will come to the same conclusion as the New Zealand i-Sites and relocate close to the attractions? Perhaps they can make themselves an attraction in their own right - *michi-no-eki* style - with the addition of food, community products, etc and links to guiding, community hosting? In any event, they will need help to be sustainable. The design mission will explore whether this could be a focus of future activity.

**Sustainability of CBT Products**

Sustainability questions hang over all the CBT products developed by the project. Some will find a way to survive and some will not. In general terms, the ones that survive in the short term will be those that become an effective complement to an FIT drawcard attraction. Many have that prospect (temples, caves and hot springs). Those that can turn this advantage into a means to grow and succeed will be the ones that find ways to integrate into local tourism patterns and with the commercial world of tour organisers and tourism
transport operators. The ones that will not make it in the long term will be those that rely on the government’s supportive hand to sustain them.

*Sustainability of Value Chain Products*

Evaluating handicraft and food products is a specialist field. In the opinion of the reviewer, there are project software elements and the results framework focus, etc that will undoubtedly sustain within MICT and will be valuable in helping communities elsewhere throughout Laos. Whether individual products – mushrooms, lettuces, etc, - will sustain, it is too early to tell. Previous New Zealand Aid Programme experience suggests that it is worth persisting with those that are faring best. There is nothing more sustainable or more easily replicated in the handicrafts and food production area than outright commercial success.

*To what extent does the activity promote local ownership and develop local capacity?*

*Community ownership*

As tourism projects go, the CBT-SED has an extreme focus on community ownership.

*Private sector ownership*

As tourism projects go, the CBT-SED is not focused on trying to engender industry ownership of project outcomes.

*Developing local capacity*

Anything in the way of local capacity building that can be delivered by government was delivered extremely well by the CBT-SED. However, there are other important ways that successful community tourism operations learn from visitors and from the tourism industry (eg “listening to the market”) that is not occurring in all cases, often because of a language barrier. Whereas language training has been tried, other ways to address this problem could be a focus in future.
Objective 5: to assess the impact of the CBT-SED programme

What positive and negative impacts have resulted to date and are likely to result from the activity after it is completed?

Positive impacts

MICT’s final report on the CBT-SED presents details of outputs and results. The reviewer discussed these with the CBT-SED Programme Director. In the reviewer’s opinion, the lasting positive impacts of the project are likely to be around:

1. The updated national and provincial tourism strategies and action plans will serve useful purposes. Some, including the national level one, could be improved with more depth of content in future editions.

2. MICT and DICT have developed capabilities in site planning methodologies and have produced useful zoning and site management plans for tourism sites.

3. The project has produced: promotional brochures, leaflets and maps of excellent quality, especially those that promote circuits or destinations and telling the stories of the areas; promotional videos that appear useful for visitor information; interactive information kiosks that appear useful, although they could be located in higher profile places; market surveys that appear very useful, although fall short of practical conclusions; and some sensible market research studies.

4. Various standards have been prepared and published, using ASEAN models, including tourism transport standards and hygiene and service standards for restaurants. These are considered by MICT as an important part of the drive to improve quality. The degree to which they will be effective may turn on the buy-in by the sector players.

5. A useful guide to tourism investment in Lao PDR has been produced. Workshops on establishing tour businesses were well received by recipients.

6. The CBT-SED-sponsored small loans scheme to the Sustainable Tourism Network of Luang Namtha generated glowing feedback from recipient operators who claim the scheme led to new private sector tour operations being developed. Based on the principle of 75% paid
back to the scheme from profits, this is an excellent model to build on.

7. A tourism business classification database and an hotel classification directory were produced, both of which appear useful.

8. The capacity of MICT and DICT staff has been built. PCU and PIU personnel and the 35 staff who were trained as trainers are clearly more confident. Training manuals and course packs were prepared and will be useful in future.

9. Pro-poor tourism awareness programmes, provincial and village-level guide training, English and other foreign language training have all been well received by recipients. The distribution of English phrasebooks and the establishment of village level stakeholder groups were well reported on by village heads. Capability has been developed for entrepreneurship training and marketing training.

10. The key infrastructure developed by the project will have lasting impacts - Plain of Jars Visitor Centre, CBT Training Centre, various tourist information centres, sanitation and water systems, access trails, signs, bridges, piers, community lodges, viewpoints, markets. All infrastructure viewed was of excellent quality and the Plain of Jars Visitor Centre displays were exceptional. As noted above, sustainability issues remain around the CBT Training Centre and the tourist information centres. All other CBT developments appear carefully designed and have the potential to give communities a massive head start towards participation in tourism.

11. MICT has developed capabilites in gender and ethnic minority development plans.

12. The project’s CBT and value chain products appear innovative and well targeted, although most will needed on-going support to sustain. The best products were those that added value to an existing tourist attraction – historic site, cave, hot spring, temple – and added value to the tourist experience through engaging with communities. Those where local stories were told to visitors will work particularly well. Story telling is a very promising value-added product to have emerged. Community lodges are, in the opinion of the reviewer, doubtful products to take any further unless they can be linked closely to regular markets and/or tour operators who will bring markets.
Negative impacts

*What would have happened without the activity?*

**FIT Patterns**

Lao’s FIT patterns would continue to build or decline through word-of-mouth and social media networks. The private sector would continue to do what it could to provide facilities and services to FITs for a fee. A few communities would benefit by being in the right place and by engaging with tourists as well as they are able to. The Lao Government would have limited capacity and means to help communities to engage with emerging tourism patterns. The Lao Government would lack confidence and capability to steer tourism growth in wholesome directions and away from unwholesome directions.

**CBT Partnerships**

The powerful combination of a supportive government tourism agency and eager communities willing to engage with tourism would be lost. The potential to add the tourism industry into this strong partnership in the future would be lost. There would be no demonstrations of successful “home-grown” / “Lao-style” tourism to persuade governors against wholesale importing of less appropriate tourism development styles.

**Objective 6: to assess the extent to which cross cutting issues have been addressed by the CBT-SED programme**

*To what extent does the activity identify and promote gender equality and women’s empowerment?*

**MFAT monitoring of gender equality**

MFAT is monitoring the project. The motive of gender equality and women’s empowerment appears well integrated in the project processes. CBT-SED players consistently use gender-disaggregated data when reporting on project activities. Many key leadership roles, although few top roles, in communities are performed by women.

**Lao Government approach**

From the Lao government side, there appears to be a norm of good gender balance in teams. There is a history of women in senior leadership roles in government, although presently only a few in top roles within MICT. Women associated with the project made no
mention of gender bias issues. The use of gender-disaggregated data appears to be institutionalised.

To what extent does the activity protect and promote human rights?

Protecting and promoting human rights

There were no human rights issues brought to the attention of the reviewer during the course of the review, nor were issues obvious from field visits.

To what extent does the activity protect the environment and manage environmental impacts and risks?

Environmental impacts and risks

There were no obvious signs of negative environmental impacts and risks from any project activities.

New Zealand’s earliest engagement with Lao tourism (Nam Ha Ecotourism) was in part motivated by finding appropriate ways to implement an integrated conservation and development regime in Lao’s protected areas, using tourism as the development tool. That emphasis appears to have been dropped in the CBT-SED, although perhaps in some projects (caves, temples, hot springs) there is at least an implication of community stewardship of resources. It could be a very useful extension of the existing project to bring back into play some aspect of the notion that a government / community / tourism industry partnership can be effective in environmental and heritage conservation? This notion has been the cornerstone of many NZ Aid Programme tourism projects elsewhere.

Objective 7: to make recommendations on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

How has the operating context (Lao tourism sector, local development needs, partner development plans and NZ development objectives) changed since the CBT-SED activity was designed, and how should these changes influence future New Zealand assistance?

The two parties, MICT and MFAT, now know each other well. There is a strong sense of partnership. Because of ADB’s influence, the CBT-SED actually ended up structured for the delivery of a project. Perhaps in future, ways can be found to make the partnership less
project-like, more flexible, more strategic. The aim could be a programme level partnership based on a strategic dialogue around growth in the tourism sector.

One essential aim of any extension of the CBT-SED should be to thoroughly reconnect CBT with mainstream tourism. The partners could set out to create wholesome and pro-poor development effects from building the whole tourism sector.

During the design stage the project was restructured with more emphasis on Part B (provisional level product development) and less on Part A (external technical advice to MICT). While this has not constrained the project, there is a need now for technical assistance at the product level to build sustainability. Rather than doing this exclusively through external technical advice, this could be in part a role for assistance from Lao’s private sector tourism industry.

Any future extension should follow the ADB / MICT idea of a destination management focus. New Zealand can bring its own experience to bear in this area. While ADB typically needs to organise first (ie destination management organisations), the New Zealand approach might be to find ways to evolve destination management systems in site-specific ways appropriate for each situation, then organise later around successful outcomes.

Any extension of the CBT-SED could also play to NZ’s strengths as a donor in other ways. New Zealand’s empathy with FIT tourism could be tapped – assisting the monitoring FIT flows, researching markets, continuing the process of identifying packages (“clusters”, “circuits” and “corridors”). New Zealand’s experience in integrating public goods (national parks, historic sites, etc) and private sector operations (hop-on-hop-off buses, home stays, backpacker lodges, etc) into such structures should be exploited. New Zealand has many examples of small, FIT tourism patterns (Fiordland boat trips, Kaikoura whale watching) that have become mainstream tourism products.

What specific areas, sub-sectors and/or approaches should future New Zealand assistance target?

Destination planning

Somewhere along the line there has been some clever, market-focused thinking in the choice of project sites and of products to focus on. There will be an on-going need for such thinking. Listening to the private sector and listening to the markets are the two key ways to
ensure this continues. No matter how clever government planners are - and the MICT has excellent planners - there is no substitute for the advice of operators who deal with the tourist everyday for a living. Somehow, the voices of the industry and the tourists need to be heard in destination planning.

**Forward as well as backwards linkages**

The problem that dates back to the implementation of the Nam Ha Ecotourism Project (focusing only on a government/community relationship and not on a government/community/industry relationship) has left a weakness in the basic model on which the CBT-SED was based. ADB acknowledges this and is trying as far as it can to address the problem through an emphasis on destination management. New Zealand can support this approach and also find other ways to engage the private sector. The tour operators seem willing. Ultimately, it will be they who bring tourists to communities and who can, if they have reason to, continue the work of building growth in the sector after the aid projects have gone.

**Refocusing the model**

The Lao tourism sector will be best served by refocusing on the notion that growth in the tourism sector can be achieved with the assistance of independent travellers, by ("step by step") trending community products upward to meet the needs of higher-yielding, quality visitors in the longer term. If this strategy is to work, the first need is for mechanisms for active interventions in areas where tourism is starting to develop. The CBT-SED has established this. The next step is to start monitoring tourist flows and acting to drive the tourist markets upwards as far as they will go. This will not happen automatically. MICT needs to monitor tourism flows and guide growth in positive directions. Without such guidance, there is the risk of getting stuck in a low-end-rut or falling into the same unwholesomeness pitfalls that neighbouring countries fell into in the past.

**Engaging other parts of government**

In some areas, especially Luang Namtha, Governors reportedly favour mainstream tourism and see the DICT’s focus on CBT as too small. International investment is more attractive. Granting a comprehensive concession for the development of a business is more attractive. In Xiengkhaoung, Khammouane and Bolikhamsay, where the project has produced mainstream products, there are reports of Governors “seeing the point”. In all four provinces this an excellent stage to reach out to Governors and encourage alignment of provincial influences around a strategy of tourism sector growth.
Engaging the private sector

Creating partnerships between public and private sectors of Lao tourism has had a chequered history (cf the work of ADB and others towards a Tourism Marketing and Development Board). Elsewhere in Asia, entrenched divergences between public and private sectors have been overcome by projects that simply encourage the sectors to work side by side (cf UNDP Partnership for Quality Tourism Project in Nepal, which created the environment for a partnership that led to the Nepal Tourism Board.) In the design phase, attention will be given to ideas around private sector operators being asked by MICT to manage a discrete component of the project, under the guidance and instruction of the PCU. The focus of this component could be “helping communities listen to visitors”.

Leveraging NZ’s understanding the FIT-led approach

In future the project might leverage more on New Zealand’s empathy with the ‘step-by-step’ approach. New Zealand experts could help with the use of tourism statistics and other metrics to develop measures of tourist flows. New Zealand is also good at integrating the management of public goods (parks, historic places, etc) with the tourism industry in destination management context. New Zealand examples could be used in other ways.

“CBT” vs ’ecotourism’ vs?

Fashionable names and fashionable processes come and go. “CBT” may be tarnished in the eyes of critics but it does accurately describe the Lao Government’s strategic emphasis. The name “CBT-SED” is also fine. If there is to be a follow on, the emphasis should swing to the “SED” end.

Other potential areas of assistance that could be explored in the design phase

There is an unquestionable need for HRD in tourism in Luang Namtha. The CBT Training Centre in Luang Namtha could service the needs of the provincial tourism sector as a whole. The emphasis might be “CPT” (communities participating in tourism).

The Plain of Jars Visitor Centre is a stunning facility that deserves to become a mainstream tourism attraction. Ways need to be found for it to become the heart of a heritage site management operation and well integrated with the private guides, souvenir selling and food serving scene.
Other CBT-SED information centres will need help to be as self sustaining as possible by whatever means possible.

Selected existing and some new CBT and value chain products could receive help to become sustainable through linkage to markets and assistance from private sector operators.

Outline a proposed goal, key outcomes and indicative outputs in the format of a Results Diagram.
Discuss the possible implementation arrangements for the new activity (e.g. the respective roles of key stakeholders – central and provincial government, private sector etc.)?

At this stage the reviewer sees no need for major structural change in any implementation arrangements. The modality works well now. It is envisaged that over time, ways will be found to be more focused on strategic outcomes, less formulaic and more flexible in methodologies, more open to external influences, more agile and responsive.

What lessons learned from the existing activity can be incorporated in the new activity?

The CBT-SED has been successful. All of its lessons are useful and should be built on. It’s success stories should be picked up and taken further. This applies in particular to: processes for developing CBT; successful CBT and value chain products; the "story telling" and on-site interpretation techniques.

Objective 8: to prepare an Activity Design Document – subject to MFAT approval to proceed – based on agreed recommendations and scope.

Activity Design Plan

1. Methodology

Key activities

Key activities of the design phase will be as prescribed in the TOR:

Design work plan (1 Day): Draft, discuss (with MFAT) and finalise review plan.

Field work in Lao PDR (7 days) : Further discussions with project personnel, MICT officials, provincial Governors, provincial Directors of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism, and CBT-SED partner agencies. Further engagements with CBT-SED stakeholders. Field work complete and findings shared with stakeholders.

Draft Activity Design Document (10 days)

Preparation of Draft Activity Design Document and submission to MFAT.

Final Activity Design Document (3 Days)

Acceptance of Activity Design Document by MFAT after revisions complete.
**Deliverables**

The draft design document will conform to the New Zealand Aid Programme’s Activity Design Guidelines. In developing the draft design document, the designer will consider:

- The scope for the design agreed by MFAT and the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism of Lao PDR at the conclusion of the review stage;
- Development of a strong sense of ownership of and commitment to the activity design by the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism of Lao PDR;
- Engagement of relevant New Zealand tourism sector expertise in the design of the activity;
- An activity up to 5 years duration and up to approximately NZD $5m in total value;
- The New Zealand Aid Programme Strategic Plan and the Sector Priorities 2012-2015;
- The New Zealand Aid Programme policies on Activity Quality, Activity Planning and Activity Implementation;
- The New Zealand Aid Programme Activity Design Document template;
- Value for money of the use of New Zealand’s Official Development Assistance (ODA).

**Timing**

The design mission will begin (if still convenient) with a discussion around the design plan (more developed by then) at the Post in Bangkok on Friday 21 March, 2014.

The Field work in Lao PDR will commence on Monday 24 March, 2014 and conclude (if still convenient) with meetings with MFAT Wellington and MFAT Bangkok personnel on the sidelines of the final six monthly meeting of the CBT-SED scheduled for 2 to 4 April in Khammouane Province. (Mr Clark is scheduled to leave Nakhon Phanom on Friday 4 April at 11.55 am).

A Draft Design Report will be submitted to MFAT on Friday 19 April.

A Final Design Report will be submitted to MFAT on Wednesday 30 April.
Costs.
The costs will be as per the existing contract.

2. **Scope**

A description of the agreed scope of a design will be finalised after discussions with MFAT around the results diagram suggested under Objective 7 above.

3. **Stakeholder consultations**

A schedule of stakeholder consultations will be arrived at after discussion with MFAT and with MICT. The starting point for discussion will be the list of stakeholders arrived at in the review phase. Additions will be made to this list, including Lux Development-sponsored LANITH project and the CBT Institute of Thailand.

**Project Coordination Unit (PCU)**
- Mr Souph Manvivong, Director, Tourism Development Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism
- Mr Thaviphet Oula, Deputy Director of Tourism Development Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, CBT-SED Programme Director thaviphet@yahoo.com
- Mr Bounpheng Souliyanon, Director of Ecotourism Division, MoICT, CBT-SED Programme Manager yaliboun@yahoo.com
- Mrs Vilaphanh LuangAphay, Director of Financial Division, Financial Controller
- Ms Acksonexay Rasttanavong, National Team Leader acksonexay@gmail.com
- Mr Douglas Hainsworth, Former International Team Leader douglas.hainsworth@gmail.com
- Ms Taryn Bodrug, Volunteer (since June 2013) taryn.bodrug@gmail.com

**Project Implementation Unites (PIUs)**
- Mr Phonesavath Kamonthong, Programme Director, Luang Namtha
- Mrs Sommala Thomvisay, Programme Manager, Luang Namtha
- Mr Khampheth Phommadueangkaisone, Programme Director, Xieng Khouang xkhtour@yahoo.com
- Mr Sivilay Oudomsouk, Programme Manager, Xieng Khouang xkhtour@yahoo.com
- Mr Panya Chanthalath, Programme Director, Khammouane
- Mr Manothong Phongsavath, Programme Manager, Khammouane
- Ms Khamyong Chommanivong, Programme Director, Bolikhamxay
- Mr Somsy Chanthamixay, Programme Manager, Bolikhamxay

**Other stakeholders**
Lessons learned

In summary, the lessons learned from this review are:

- The partnership between a government / communities around CBT works well to empower communities to engage in tourism.

- The Lao government is genuine in its wish to drive economic development through wholesome styles of tourism in which local communities can participate and which respect Lao values.

- CBT as an end in itself can be self limiting. Returning to Lao’s “Following the FITs” strategy for developing tourism is the key.

- This means not being content with budget FITs, but instead monitoring the patterns FITs are pioneering, then engaging with the industry to drive markets upwards.

- Lao’s original vision when it allowed FITs in through its borders, was that “step by step”, through improvements to product quality the markets would move upwards.

- This is best done through a destination management approach, rather than focusing only on individual products.

- A dialogue with provincial governors is required to reengage CBT with mainstream economic development agendas. CBT should not be an alternative to mainstream tourism.
Other government agencies should be aligned with MICT and DICTs in the tourism development agenda.

More can be made of the other mandates within the MICT, especially around strategic monitoring (using tourism statistics to measure tourist flows and yield) and on the cultural side (linking tourism management and heritage site management).

The private sector could help MICT to implement part of a future project, importantly to helping communities “listen to visitors”.

The private sector could also be asked to help CBT products make linkages to markets.

The CBT-SED information and visitor centres will need help to be viable.

There is strong enthusiasm in Laos for making links with the New Zealand tourism industry and leveraging on New Zealand comparative advantages as a donor in tourism.

Recommendations

That MFAT proceed to design of a new project that builds on the well-established and constructive partnership of MICT and MFAT and that the new design addresses the lesson learned from the CBT-SED and the new directions implied in this review.
Appendix A: Terms of Reference for the Review of the Community-Based Tourism for Sustainable Economic Development Project, Lao PDR

Background information

Tourism is one of the most important and expanding economic sectors in the Lao PDR and the Lao Government recognises tourism’s role in making positive contributions to poverty reduction and national social and economic development in its National Socio-Economic Development Plan.

The CBT-SED activity builds on the relationships and experience that New Zealand has gained in working on past projects in the tourism sector with the Government of the Lao PDR and the Tourism Development Department under the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism (previously called the Lao PDR National Tourism Administration (LNTA)). New Zealand contributed approximately $1 million of funding to the award-winning Nam Ha Ecotourism project in Luang Namtha from 1997-2008 and approximately $1.7 million of funding assistance to the UNESCO-managed Fighting Poverty at the Plain of Jars project in Xieng Khouang from 2006-2010. New Zealand has become a 'port of first call' for tourism support in the Lao PDR, in particular for community based and pro-poor tourism.

The current three-year CBT-SED activity with a total budget of USD$3,466,030 is implemented in 4 provinces - Khammouane, Xieng Khouang, Bolikhamxay and Luang Namtha with the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism. This activity is designed to scale up the success of the community based eco-tourism project at Nam Ha in Luang Namtha province in the other provinces. The activity started its implementation from 1 April 2011 and will end on 31st March 2014. We are currently considering further support to the tourism sector in the Lao PDR.

The goal of the CBT-SED activity is to promote economic growth to reduce poverty in the four focus provinces in Lao PDR. The activity aims to build the capacity of provincial tourist departments to implement the National Tourism Strategy and contribute to the development of community based tourism and value chain improvements.
Activities include construction of small scale tourism infrastructure (e.g. tourism information centres, accommodation lodges, national community-based tourism training centre), the development of tours and destinations, entrepreneurship training for local people, the development of tourism site management plans and provincial tourism strategies, and the production of brochures, guidebooks, promotional videos, touch-screen kiosks, and a hotel and guesthouse classification programme.

The Tourism Development Department under the Ministry of Information, Culture, and Tourism, is the executing agency responsible for the implementation of the CBT-SED programme. The activity also provides assistance through the Tourism Divisions under the Provincial Departments of Information, Culture and Tourism, the private sector, and local communities in the four target provinces to develop pro-poor and community based tourism services and products.

The CBT-SED consists of three main components:

1. **Part A: Planning, Marketing and Hotel Management Support** for the implementation of three departmental work plans of the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism;

2. **Part B: Provincial Tourism CBT and Value Chain Development** that supports pro-poor community based tourism, and value chain interventions;

3. **Part C: Implementation Assistance and Support** to ensure effective Programme implementation is delivered.

**Purpose of the Assignment**

The assignment will comprise two phases.

**Phase I: Review of the CBT-SED**

The goal of the CBT-SED activity review is to examine CBT-SED activities to date, identify lessons learned, assess objectives, results and impacts of the CBT-SED intervention, and make recommendations to MFAT on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

The results of the programme review will be reported/disseminated to the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and the Lao Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism (MICT) and used to
inform MFAT and MICT on the direction of any further assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

**Phase II: Design of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector**

The goal of Phase II will be to develop an Activity Design Document for the implementation of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector. This new phase of support will have an indicative length of 5 years and an indicative budget of NZ$5m.

Proceeding to Phase II: Design will be at the sole discretion of MFAT. The scope for the design will be developed as part of the Phase I: Review (see Objective 7 below) and finalised and agreed by MFAT and the Lao government prior to Phase II proceeding.

**Scope of the Assignment**

The time period covered by the review is 1 April 2011 - December 2013.

The geographic focus is the four target provinces of the CBT-SED programme including Luang Namtha, Xieng Khouang, Bolikhamxay and Khammouane.

The target groups are; i) Project Coordination Unit (PCU) at the national level from the Department of Tourism Development under the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism in Vientiane; ii) Project Implementation Units (PIUs) at the provincial level from Tourism Divisions under the Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of the four provinces; iii) private sector (e.g. travel agents, tourist product entrepreneurs); iv) selected villages and community members.

The reviewer should also consult with senior officials from the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, provincial governors, other donors to the tourism sector (e.g. ADB, SDC, JICA, SNV) and with New Zealand MFAT’s International Development Group.

The reviewer should ensure the target groups and key stakeholders are consulted for the design development of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector.

**Review criteria and objectives**

*Criteria being assessed*

The CBT-SED will be reviewed against the DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The Activity approach to gender equality, human rights, and the environment should also be assessed.
Objectives and review questions

The objectives of the activity review are to:

**Objective 1:** to assess the relevance of the CBT-SED programme
- To what extent does the activity continue to be relevant to beneficiaries, the New Zealand Aid Programme and partner country development priorities?
- To what extent have the benefits from the activity addressed the needs of the different groups of stakeholders?
- To what extent is the programme approach (community based tourism) relevant and appropriate to the context of the Lao tourism sector? Are there other approaches that are now more appropriate?

**Objective 2:** to assess the effectiveness of the CBT-SED programme
- To what extent have intended outcomes of the Activity been equitably achieved as a result of the activity?
- What unintended outcomes (positive and negative) have occurred as a result of the activity?
- What has constrained or enhanced the achievement of outcomes?
- How have the different risks and challenges that have emerged during the implementation of the project been managed?

**Objective 3:** to assess the efficiency of the CBT-SED programme
- Have resources been used in the best areas, and in the best possible way, in order to provide value for money?
- What is the quality of partner and MFAT management (e.g., activity planning, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and risk management)?
- Is the activity well coordinated with other development support provided to the Lao tourism sector?

**Objective 4:** to assess the sustainability of the CBT-SED programme
- What is the likelihood of continued long-term benefits after the activity has been completed?
- To what extent does the activity promote local ownership and develop local capacity?

**Objective 5:** to assess the impact of the CBT-SED programme
- What positive and negative impacts have resulted to date and are likely to result from the activity after it is completed?
- What would have happened without the activity?

**Objective 6:** to assess the extent to which *cross cutting issues* have been addressed by the CBT-SED programme

- To what extent does the activity identify and promote gender equality and women’s empowerment?
- To what extent does the activity protect and promote human rights?
- To what extent does the activity protect the environment and manage environmental impacts and risks?

**Objective 7:** to make *recommendations* on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

- How has the operating context (Lao tourism sector, local development needs, partner development plans and NZ development objectives) changed since the CBT-SED activity was designed, and how should these changes influence future New Zealand assistance?
- What specific areas, sub-sectors and/or approaches should future New Zealand assistance target?
- Outline a proposed goal, key outcomes and indicative outputs in the format of a Results Diagram.
- Discuss the possible implementation arrangements for the new activity (e.g. the respective roles of key stakeholders – central and provincial government, private sector etc.)?
- What lessons learned from the existing activity can be incorporated in the new activity?

**Objective 8:** to prepare an *Activity Design Document* – subject to MFAT approval to proceed - based on agreed recommendations and scope.

**Methodology for the Review and Design**

**Principles/ approach**

The principles underpinning the programme review are partnership, participation, transparency, capacity building and local ownership.

The review will be delivered through desk research, briefings in Wellington and Bangkok, on-site meetings and interviews with key stakeholders, stakeholder groups and other relevant interlocutors in
Vientiane, Luang Namtha, Xiengkhouang, Bolikhamxay, and Khammouane provinces of Lao PDR, and a wrap up meeting to present an outline of findings and likely recommendations arising from the exercise. A draft report will be submitted, to be followed by a Final Report incorporating any negotiated changes. The Report is to be succinct, and preferably no longer than 20 pages.

In developing the methodology for the design, the consultant will need to ensure that the activity design considers the following:

- The scope for the design agreed by MFAT and the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism of Lao PDR at the conclusion of the review stage;
- Development of a strong sense of ownership of and commitment to the activity design by the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism of Lao PDR;
- Engagement of relevant New Zealand tourism sector expertise in the design of the activity;
- An activity up to 5 years duration and up to approximately NZD $5m in total value;
- The New Zealand Aid Programme policies on Activity Quality, Activity Planning and Activity Implementation;
- The New Zealand Aid Programme Activity Design Document template;
- Value for money of the use of New Zealand’s Official Development Assistance (ODA).

Participatory approaches should be used in the review and design where appropriate. A participatory approach is expected at a minimum during stakeholder consultation, analysis of findings, identification of recommendations, and development of an activity design.

**Review Plan**

The reviewer will develop a review plan (using or being guided by the Evaluation Plan Template) before undertaking the review.

The intended results of the Activity (i.e. the goal, outcomes and outputs) will be clarified and described in a Results Diagram (program logic, logic model) in the review plan.

The review plan will describe how cross-cutting issues will be considered throughout the review. The review plan is to be appended to the main written report.
Design Plan
The reviewer will develop a design plan that describes the methodology for the design, key activities to be undertaken in the design, the deliverables, proposed stakeholders to be consulted, and their timing and costs.

The person who will approve the review and design plans is Romchalee Kanokngamwitroj, Senior Development Programme Coordinator. The plans may need to be redrafted if they do not meet the required standard or are unclear. The review and design plans must be approved prior to the commencement of any field work or other substantive work.

Review and Design Team composition
The review and design will be undertaken by a single contractor.

The attributes (knowledge, skills, experience) required of the reviewer are:

- Relevant qualifications and extensive experience in undertaking reviews and designs of a similar nature - in terms of subject matter, scope, scale and value.
- Expertise in the tourism sector, particularly community based tourism, the development and implementation of country-level destination brands, marketing strategies and campaigns, programme management, and evaluation/review and design.
- Experience of working in a coordinated manner with partner governments, development partners and the private sector to achieve agreed results.
- Experience working in developing countries preferably Southeast Asia and with evidence of cultural sensitivity in multi-cultural contexts.
- Have evidence of previous project reviews completed.
- Have evidence of gender, environmental and human rights analysis competencies.

Review and design governance and management
The review (and potential design) is commissioned by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and the reviewer(s) will be accountable to MFAT.

The partner government including the Tourism Development Department under the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, and four tourism divisions of the Provincial Departments of Information, Culture and Tourism will provide in-kind contribution to
the programme review and design including project staff and time to be provided for the review and design missions.

Oversight of the review and design process will be the responsibility of MFAT Contract Manager (Brent Rapson, First Secretary - Development).

The Activity Manager (Romchalee Kanokngamwitoj) is responsible for day-to-day management and administration of the review and design. Responsibilities include briefing the consultant; managing feedback from reviews of the draft reports and design documents; and liaising with the consultant throughout to ensure the review is being undertaken as agreed.

The contracting process will be managed by IDG GLO in Wellington.

**Review and design outputs and milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Output/milestone</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicative Inputs</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Indicative payment proportion of fees for fixed price contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Background research study</td>
<td>Desk research on the development of Lao tourism sector and the CBT-SED programme</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Mid-Jan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wellington briefing</td>
<td>Briefings with Development Manager in Wellington, including preparations and travel.</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mid-Jan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review plan</td>
<td>Draft, discuss (with MFAT) and finalise review plan</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Mid-Jan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bangkok briefing</td>
<td>Briefing with First Secretary – Development and Senior Development Programme Coordinator in Bangkok</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mid-Late Jan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Output/milestone</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Indicative Inputs</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Indicative payment proportion of fees for fixed price contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Field work in Lao PDR</td>
<td>Briefings and interviews with project personnel, MICT officials, provincial Governors, provincial Directors of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism, and CBT-SED partner agencies. Attend activities with CBT-SED personnel. Conduct independent engagements with CBT-SED stakeholders. Field work complete and findings shared with PCU at a wrap up meeting</td>
<td>7 days in-country field work, 1 day stakeholder feedback</td>
<td>Mid-late Jan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td>Preparation of draft report and submission to MFAT.</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Early Feb</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Acceptance/approval by MFAT after any revisions of the draft are completed and debriefing.</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Mid Feb</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase II: Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Output/milestone</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicative Inputs</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Indicative payment proportion of fees for fixed price contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Design work plan</td>
<td>Draft, discuss (with MFAT) and finalise review plan</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mid Feb</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Output/milestone</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Indicative Inputs</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Indicative payment proportion of fees for fixed price contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9   | Field work in Lao PDR        | Further discussions with project personnel, MICT officials, provincial Governors, provincial Directors of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism, and CBT-SED partner agencies.  
Funding engagements with CBT-SED stakeholders.  
Field work complete and findings shared with stakeholders. | 7 days            | Mid-late Feb      | -                                                           |
| 6   | Draft Activity Design Document | Preparation of Draft Activity Design Document and submission to MFAT                                                                                                                                   | 10 days          | Late Feb – early March | 30%                                                         |
| 7   | Final Activity Design Document | Acceptance of Activity Design Document by MFAT after revisions complete                                                                                                                                  | 3 days            | Early – Mid March  | 20%                                                         |

**Review and Design reporting requirements**

Required deliverables are:

*Phase I: Review of the CBT-SED*

**A Review Plan**, providing:
- The methodology for the review and a description of the key activities to be undertaken in the review, the deliverables and their timing.
- Key questions to be used to assess performance of the activity against the set criteria and review objectives and to identify potential scope of future New Zealand support to the Lao tourism sector.
- A description of the intended results of the Activity (i.e. the goal, outcomes and outputs) in a results diagram as per the Activity Results Framework.
• A description of the principles underpinning the review and how the proposed approach will reflect these.
• A description of how cross-cutting issues will be considered throughout the review.
• A list of stakeholders to be consulted during the review.

A Draft Review Report
• The review report must meet quality standards as described in New Zealand Aid Programme Activity Evaluation Operational Policy. These quality standards are based on 2010 DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation and New Zealand Aid Programme Activity evaluation operational policy, guideline and templates.

• The draft review report will be reviewed by MFAT staff, stakeholders and/or external experts. Further work or revisions of the report may be required if it is considered that the report does not meet the requirements of this TOR, if there are factual errors, if the report is incomplete, or if it is not of an acceptable standard.

• The draft report should:
  o Make an assessment of the objectives, results and impact of the CBT-SED programme in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, mitigating factors, sustainability, impact, and cross cutting issues of project activities.
  o Provide commentary on whether or not an extension to the activity is recommended, and provide guidance as to potential future support to tourism in Lao PDR as detailed in the objectives section (p. 6). A short (2 page) draft concept note / Terms of Reference for the design of a new phase of support should be annexed to the draft report.
  o Identify challenges and recommend ways and approaches for technical cooperation activities between MICT and MFAT to address these.

• The Review Report must be succinct and concise, preferably no longer than 20 pages, and be guided by the New Zealand Aid Programme Evaluation Report template. A brief Executive Summary and list of recommendations in priority order should form the first part of the Report.

A Final Review Report
• The Final Review Report should include amendments, alterations and changes to the draft report negotiated and agreed with MFAT.
• The report must contain an abstract suitable for publishing on the New Zealand Aid Programme website. Instructions for the abstract can be found in the Evaluation Report template.

• Copies of the report are to be delivered by email to the MFAT Contract Manager.

• It is MFAT policy to make review reports publicly available (e.g. on the New Zealand Aid Programme website) unless there is prior agreement not to do so. Any information that could prevent the release of a review report under the Official Information or Privacy Acts, or would breach evaluation ethical standards should not be included in the report. The final report will be approved for public release by the Deputy Director or Development Counsellor in the team responsible for the commissioning of the review.

Phase II: Design of a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector

A Design Plan

• The methodology for the design and a description of the key activities to be undertaken in the design, the deliverables, their timing and costs.
• A description of the agreed scope of a design in a results diagram as per the Activity Results Framework.
• A list of stakeholders to be consulted during the design.
• A description of how cross-cutting issues will be considered throughout the design.

Draft Activity Design Document

The draft design document should conform to the New Zealand Aid Programme’s Activity Design Guidelines.

Final Activity Design Document

The Final Activity Design Document should reflect amendments, alterations and changes to the draft ADD negotiated and agreed with MFAT and the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism of Lao PDR.

Relevant reports and documents

Relevant documents will be provided to the reviewer prior to the review. These key documents include:

• CBT-SED design documents;
• CBT-SED programme progress reports;
• Annual Monitoring Assessment reports for the CBT-SED programme;
• IDG Strategy and Sector Priorities;
• IDG Evaluation and Design Policies and Guidelines.
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Introduction

**Background and context to the Activity**

Tourism is one of the most important and expanding economic sectors in the Lao PDR. CBT-SED activity is intended to promote economic growth to reduce poverty in the four focus provinces in Lao PDR by building the capacity of provincial tourist departments to implement the National Tourism Strategy and contribute to the development of community based tourism and value chain improvements. The goal of the CBT-SED activity review is to examine CBT-SED activities to date, identify lessons learned, assess objectives, results and impacts of the CBT-SED intervention, and make recommendations to MFAT on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector. The results of the programme review will be reported/disseminated to the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and the Lao Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism (MICT) and used to inform MFAT and MICT on the direction of any further assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

**Scope of the review**

The review scope does not vary from the terms of reference.

The time period covered by the review is 1 April 2011 - December 2013. The geographic focus is the four target provinces of the CBT-SED programme including Luang Namtha, Xieng Khouang, Bolikhamsay and Khammouane. The target groups are; i) Project Coordination Unit (PCU) at the national level from the Department of Tourism Development under the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism in Vientiane; ii) Project Implementation Units (PIUs) at the provincial level from Tourism Divisions under the Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of the four provinces; iii) private sector (e.g. travel agents, tourist product entrepreneurs); iv) selected villages and community members. Senior officials from the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, provincial governors, other donors to the tourism sector (e.g. ADB, SDC, JICA, SNV) and MFAT’s International Development Group will also be consulted.

**Purpose of the review**

The review purpose does not vary from the terms of reference.

The purpose of the review is to examine CBT-SED activities to date, identify lessons learned, assess objectives, results and impacts of the
CBT-SED intervention, and make recommendations to MFAT on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.

**New Zealand Aid Programme evaluation principles underpinning this review**

The principles underpinning the programme review are partnership, participation, transparency, capacity building and local ownership. Participatory approaches will be to the fore in all aspects of the review, in particular stakeholder consultations, analysis of findings, identification of recommendations and development of the design. Using participatory approaches in appropriate ways means tailoring the approach to the context, ensuring that appropriate behavioural norms are observed with all stakeholders so that they have a voice in the review and stake in the design.

**Objectives and Review Questions**

The review objectives and questions are as stated in the Terms of Reference.

The objective of the work is to provide a comprehensive review of the CBT-SED activities to date as the basis for decisions about a new phase of support to the Lao tourism sector.

**Stakeholder Analysis**

This table shows the stakeholders and outlines their interest in the review, any issues or constraints and their expected involvement. A list of intended interviewees is attached as Appendix B and a programme for the review mission is attached as Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest/stake</th>
<th>Issues/constraints</th>
<th>Involvement/participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Embassy, Bangkok</td>
<td>Project Oversight (Primary)</td>
<td>Nil - willing and welcoming</td>
<td>Briefings and debriefing around visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordination Unit (PCU)</td>
<td>Project Coordination (Primary)</td>
<td>Nil - willing and welcoming</td>
<td>Briefings, debriefings and group meetings, individual consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Interest/stake</td>
<td>Issues/constraints</td>
<td>Involvement/participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation Sites (PIUs) (Luang Namtha, Xieng Khouang, Khammouane, Bolikhamxay)</td>
<td>Project Implementation (Primary)</td>
<td>Meetings arranged, apparently without difficulty</td>
<td>Group meetings and individual consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups and individuals in provinces seeking to participate in tourism</td>
<td>Project beneficiaries (Primary)</td>
<td>Time constraints may prevent first hand consultations in the review phase</td>
<td>Consultations with secondary sources in Vientiane and in the provinces as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank (Lao PDR &amp; Thailand)</td>
<td>Partner project in tourism (Primary?)</td>
<td>Nil - willing and welcoming</td>
<td>Individual meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Partner donor in tourism (Primary?)</td>
<td>None expected</td>
<td>Individual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Partner Donor (Secondary)</td>
<td>None expected</td>
<td>Individual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Partner Donor (Secondary)</td>
<td>None expected</td>
<td>Individual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agents</td>
<td>Tourism industry linkages (Secondary - perhaps one day Primary?)</td>
<td>None expected</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector operators, tour operators, tour guides</td>
<td>Tourism industry linkages (Secondary - perhaps one day Primary?)</td>
<td>None expected</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intended Results of the Activity

This table contains the reviewer’s comments against the CBT-SED programme results diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1. Existing Results Diagram: Activities and Input Table</th>
<th>Reviewer’s Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Activities to Delivery Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Updated national &amp; provincial tourism strategies and action plans and tourist site management plans developed</strong> <em>(Planning and Cooperation Department)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Update provincial tourism strategies and action plans</td>
<td>- Stakeholder meetings &amp; workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Study visit on CBT and supply chain for provincial stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update and approve plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Develop tourist site management plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Site surveys, consultation with stakeholders and draft plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approval and dissemination of plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Develop tourist site management plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review and develop site planning methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Site surveys, consultation with stakeholders and draft plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approval and dissemination of plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Marketing strategies, promotional materials, media and research tools developed and implemented (Marketing and Promotion Department)

| Development and production of promotional materials and media tools | - Design and print maps, brochures, guidebooks, etc.  
- Production of promotional videos  
- Review and update website design and content  
- Touch screen kiosks developed and deployed | - Funded as part of the Grant  
- MICT will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $262,594 (USD), $341,031 (NZD) | Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting the PCU, MOICT Marketing and Promotion Department and the PIUs and provincial tourism officials; personally assessing the promotional materials and media tools; and asking the views of private sector tourism operators and other interested stakeholders regarding their value.  
- Funded as part of the Grant  
- MICT and PTDs will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors as well as other development partners will provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $67,760 (USD), $88,000 (NZD)  
- Development of marketing strategies | - Conduct basic marketing research at the provincial level  
- Review and update provincial marketing strategy and action plan  
- Develop marketing research survey tools  
- Conduct marketing research  
- Participation in national-regional tourism trade shows | Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting PCU, MOICT Marketing and Promotion Department and PIUs and provincial tourism officials; personally assessing the provincial marketing strategies; and asking the views of private sector tourism operators and other interested stakeholders regarding the value of the provincial marketing activities. |

### 3. ASEAN tourism standards and tourism business support (Hotel and Tourism Management Department)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting PCU and MOICT Hotel and Tourism Management Department; personally assessing the standards; and asking the views of private sector tourism operators and other interested stakeholders regarding their value.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Implement ASEAN tourism standards programme                          | Research, adapt and approve ASEAN tourism standards relevant to the MICT’s Hotel and Tourism Management Department, such as CBT and restaurant standards                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Funded as part of the Grant  
- MICT will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed  
- Total funds allocated: $30,800 (USD), $40,000 (NZD)                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Promotion for tour operator and accommodation investment             | Design and publish a "how to" guide on tourism-sector investment  
- National & provincial workshops on establishing tour businesses                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Funded as part of the Grant  
- MICT will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed  
- Total funds allocated: $65,450 (USD), $85,000 (NZD)                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Develop tourism businesses classification database                   | Develop and maintain tourism businesses classification database                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Funded as part of the Grant  
- MICT will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed  
- Total funds allocated: $9,240 (USD), $12,000 (NZD)                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
### 4. Equitable tourism development through the implementation of gender and ethnic minority development plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Funding Details</th>
<th>Reviewer Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Implement gender and ethnic minority development plans</td>
<td>- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time</td>
<td>Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT and PCU; and personally assessing the gender and ethnic minority development plans, and asking the views of development specialists and other interested stakeholders regarding their value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review and update gender &amp; ethnic economic development plans</td>
<td>- Technical Advisors and external consultants will provide assistance as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workshops on anti-trafficking and safe migration</td>
<td>- Total funds allocated: $33,880 (USD), $44,000 NZD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Improved capacity of the MOICT and PTDs to develop pro-poor tourism products (CBT pro-poor supply chains)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Funding Details</th>
<th>Reviewer Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Capacity building of PIUs: PCU, PIU, and PTD staff</td>
<td>- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time</td>
<td>Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PDU, PIUs and PTD staff, and asking the views of concerned stakeholders regarding the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- English/foreign language training</td>
<td>- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Computer use training</td>
<td>- Total funds allocated: $61,600 (USD), $80,000 NZD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Pro-poor tourism awareness programmes | - District level pro-poor tourism awareness seminars | - Funded as part of the Grant
- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed.
- Total funds allocated: $15,400 (USD), 20,000 NZD |
| Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; and asking the views of private sector tourism operators and other interested stakeholders regarding their value. |

| 6. Pro-poor tourism product development through investment and skills training |
| - Development of community-based tourism products | - Detailed survey and assessment of CBT products
- Establishment of community stakeholder groups
- Establishment of village-specific CBT rules & operational agreements
- Support to small, local inbound tour operators | - Funded as part of the Grant
- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed.
- Total funds allocated: $129,360 (USD), $168,000 NZD |
| Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; and asking the views of private sector tourism operators and other interested stakeholders about the new products |
| Establishment of National CBT Field Training Site | Review and draft CBT-related course training materials  
- Develop management systems and trainer job descriptions  
- Recruit & train MOICT-based trainers  
- Develop professional certification schemes for trainees  
- Design and publish training manuals and course packs  
- Construct National CBT Training Center facility at PTD site | Funded as part of the Grant  
- MOICT and PTD will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $77,770 (USD), $101,000 NZD | **Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by:** analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; personally viewing course materials, manuals, training packs, etc, and asking the views of private sector tourism operators and other interested stakeholders about the value of the Training. |
|---|---|---|
| Pro-poor tourism awareness programmes | Village level pro-poor tourism awareness seminars | Funded as part of the Grant  
- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $36,960 (USD), $48,000 NZD | **Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by:** analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; and asking the views of community advisors and other commentators associated with communities regarding the value of these programmes |
| - Entrepreneurship and tourism skills training for local people | - Entrepreneurship training  
- Marketing training for small tourism businesses  
- Provincial and village guide training  
- English/foreign language training  
- Training on community fund management | - Funded as part of the Grant  
- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors and external consultants will provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $127,820 (USD), $166,000 NZD |

**Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by:** analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; and asking the views of private sector tourism operators, community advisors and other commentators associated with communities regarding the value of these programmes.
| - Development of pro-poor tourism supply chains | - Survey and map linkages between local producers and consumers  
- Exchange visits & workshops for traders/suppliers and producers  
- Technical and skills training on value adding to local products  
- Support local producers to attend trade fairs  
- Assist villagers to enter into equitable supply agreements with traders | - Funded as part of the Grant  
- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors and external consultants will provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $200,200 (USD), $260,000 NZD | Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; and personally reviewing the supply chain surveys, reports of training and trade fairs and any agreements with traders. |
| - Design and Construct Small-Scale Tourism Infrastructure | - Sanitation and water systems  
- Tourist information centre  
- Access trails, signage, bridges, river piers  
- Community lodges, viewpoints, markets | - Funded as part of the Grant  
- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors and external consultants will provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $847,770 (USD), $1,101,000 NZD | Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; and either personally viewing or reviewing reports of small scale tourism infrastructure. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Formation of tourism networks and stakeholder associations | - Creation of tourism networks and stakeholder associations  
- Develop provincial tourism stakeholders network operating document  
- Conduct tourism stakeholders network meetings  
- Disseminate information on the network & membership promotion  
- Exposure tour to successful CBT projects | - Funded as part of the Grant  
- MOICT and PTDs will provide staff time  
- Technical Advisors and stakeholders will provide assistance as needed.  
- Total funds allocated: $100,100 (USD), $130,000 NZD | Reviewer will check outputs/outcomes of this work by: analysing baseline and progress reports; consulting MOICT, PCU, PIUs and PTD personnel; and asking the views of private sector tourism operators, community advisors and other commentators associated with provincial community tourism regarding the value of the networks, associations, exposure tours. |
### Part 2. Existing Results Diagram: Results Measurement Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Information and Targets</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Sources</th>
<th>Review Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term outcomes (10-15 years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos’ tourism sector contributes to national economic development</td>
<td>- Increase tourist arrivals from 2010 levels</td>
<td>- Baseline: 2,513,028 Target: 4,099,651</td>
<td>- Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Reviewer will update statistics from these sources and review progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in average tourist length of stay from 2010 levels</td>
<td>- Baseline: 4.5 Target: 6.0</td>
<td>- National statistic Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in total tourism spending from 2010 levels</td>
<td>- Baseline: $381,669,031 USD Target:$ US 4,620,152,872</td>
<td>- statistics from Ministry of Trade and Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in direct and indirect Employment in tourism sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Immigration Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in percentage of contribution to the National GDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium-term outcomes (5 to 10 years)</strong></td>
<td>i. percentage of plan implemented</td>
<td>Baseline: 0 Target: 50</td>
<td>- Information available from official statistics (MICT &amp; PDICT)</td>
<td>Reviewer will update statistics from these sources and review progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Marketing: Number of tourism arrivals</td>
<td>Baseline: 2,513,028 Target: 3 million visitors</td>
<td>- tourist satisfaction survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. tourist satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provincial development budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Visitor frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Short-term outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Standards set and plans implemented for site management, marketing and tourism management</th>
<th>- Number of action plans developed</th>
<th>- Target: 38</th>
<th>Information available from government plans and reports</th>
<th>Reviewer will seek information on whether standards have been set and plans implemented site management, marketing and tourism management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased knowledge of the MICT and PDICTs</td>
<td>- Number of MOICT staff benefitting from training</td>
<td>- Target: 50 - Target: 60</td>
<td>Information available from records of training participation</td>
<td>Reviewer will review the records of training participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Improved tourism management skills of the MICT and PDICTs | - Increase in the number of tourism plans approved and implemented | - Baseline: 0 - Target: 70 | Information available from government plans and reports | Reviewer will seek information on the relative number of tourism plans approved and implemented. |

| 3. Increased tourism revenue in 4 provinces | - increase tourism income per household in 4 targeted province | Baseline: Target: | Information available from government plans and reports | Reviewer will seek information on the relative number of tourism plans approved and implemented. |

<p>| iii. Tourism standards: Number of tourism standards in place | Baseline: 0 Target: 4 standards | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Updated provincial tourism strategies and action plans and tourist site management plans developed (Planning and Cooperation Department)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDICTs to develop tourism products</th>
<th>- Number of PTD staff benefiting from training and project engagement</th>
<th>3. Improved pro-poor tourism products (community-based tourism and value chain interventions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of new CBT interventions developed/improved</td>
<td>- Number of new CBT interventions developed/improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of new value chain interventions developed</td>
<td>- Target: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of gender and ethnic minority participation plans prepared</td>
<td>- Target: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Percentage of beneficiaries of CBT and value chain interventions that are women.</td>
<td>- Target: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Percentage CBT and value chain interventions that benefit ethnic minorities</td>
<td>- Target: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information available from: Project activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bi-annual implementation review and planning workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer will review the project activity reports and outcomes of bi-annual implementation review and planning workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Update provincial tourism strategies and action plans</td>
<td>- Number of updated tourism strategies and action plans</td>
<td>- Target: 11 provincial and 1 National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop tourist site management plans</td>
<td>- A site planning methodology</td>
<td>- Target: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Promotional materials and media tools produced and marketing research tools implemented (Marketing and Promotion Department)

<p>| - Development and production of national-level promotional materials and media tools | - Number of maps, brochures, guidebooks,… | - Target: 10,000 units | Information available from: | Reviewer will seek information on the amount of national-level marketing collateral produced and, principally throughout consultations with the private sector operators, |
| | - Number of promotional videos | - Target: 4 | - Existence of materials | |
| | - The national level tourism website to be regularly updated | - Target: 1 update/month | - Existence of videos | |
| | | - Target: 4 | - Evidence of website | |
| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of kiosks operating</th>
<th>Kiosks in operation</th>
<th>assess its perceived value to the industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of research tools</td>
<td>Existence of tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of provincial-level marketing strategies &amp; promotion materials</th>
<th>- Market research reports</th>
<th>Target: 4 (1/prov.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marketing strategies and action plans</td>
<td>Target: 4 (1/prov.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of maps, brochures, guidebooks, etc</td>
<td>Target: 16 (4/prov.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of shows attended</td>
<td>Target: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provincial tourism websites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information available from:</th>
<th>Existence of reports</th>
<th>Existence of strategies/plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records of participation</td>
<td>Existence of promo materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewer will seek information on the amount of provincial-level marketing collateral produced and, principally throughout consultations with the private sector operators, assess its perceived value to the industry.

3. ASEAN tourism standards program, tourism businesses classification database and hotel classification directory developed with tour operator and accommodation investment promoted *(Hotel and Tourism Management Department)*

- Implement ASEAN tourism standards program

- Research, adapt and approve ASEAN tourism standards relevant to the MOICT’s Hotel and Tourism Management Department, such as CBT and restaurant standards

- Target: 2 ses standards

- Completed standards

Reviewer will consult with MOICT personnel and ask private sector operators about progress on ASEAN standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- Promotion for tour operator and accommodation investment</th>
<th>- Increased number of registered tourism businesses</th>
<th>- Baseline: 3,353</th>
<th>Target: (+20%)</th>
<th>Businesses registration records</th>
<th>Reviewer will consult with MOICT personnel and other officials on relative increases in tourism business registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Develop tourism businesses classification database</td>
<td>Tourism businesses classification database</td>
<td>- Target: 1</td>
<td>- Existence of database</td>
<td>Reviewer will consult with MOICT personnel and private sector operators about progress with and value of the tourism businesses classification databases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Production of hotel classification directory</td>
<td>Hotel classification directory</td>
<td>- Target: 1</td>
<td>- Existence of directory</td>
<td>Reviewer will consult with MOICT personnel and private sector operators about progress with and value of the hotel classification directory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Equitable tourism development through the implementation of gender and ethnic minority development plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- Implement gender and ethnic minority development plans</th>
<th>- Development and implementation of plans</th>
<th>- Target: 4</th>
<th>Information available from existence of plans</th>
<th>Reviewer will seek up-to-date information on the existence and implementation of gender and ethnic minority development plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Total participation of women and ethnic minorities in project activites</td>
<td>- Minimum of 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Improved capacity of the MOICT and PTDs to develop pro-poor tourism products (CBT pro-poor supply chains)

<p>| - Capacity building of PCU, PIU, and PTD | - Number of participants | - Target: 30 | Information available from records of participation | Reviewer will seek summaries of the capacity building activities and number of participants. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Pro-poor tourism awareness programmes</th>
<th>Number of district-level participants</th>
<th>Target: 200 (50/province X 4)</th>
<th>Information available from:</th>
<th>Reviewer will seek summaries of the district-level pro-poor tourism awareness programmes and number of participants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of community-based tourism products</td>
<td>Number of sites that have new tourism products</td>
<td>Target: 8</td>
<td>Information available from:</td>
<td>Reviewer will seek to view new products and review project activity reports in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of National CBT Field Training Site:</td>
<td>Number of training materials drafted - Management system and job descriptions - Number of trainers trained and recruited - Number of training materials published - Number of expected graduates</td>
<td>10 - 6 - 10 - 50</td>
<td>Information available from:</td>
<td>Reviewer will seek to review training materials, operational guidelines, job descriptions, trainers recruitment records and inquire about the existence of the National CBT Field Training Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-poor tourism awareness programmes</td>
<td>Number of villages-level participants</td>
<td>Target: 1,600 (100/villages X 16 villages)</td>
<td>Information available from:</td>
<td>Reviewer will seek to review summaries of the village-level pro-poor tourism awareness programmes and number of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Target/Specifics</td>
<td>Information Sources</td>
<td>Reviewer Actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship and tourism skills training for local people</td>
<td>Number of local people trained</td>
<td>Target: 2,420</td>
<td>Information available from records of participation</td>
<td>Reviewer will seek to review records of participation and ask the opinions of private sector operators and community commentators about the entrepreneurship and tourism skills training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of pro-poor tourism supply chains</td>
<td>Number of supply chain that have been developed or strengthened</td>
<td>Target: 8, Target: 800, Target: 1,200 (8 X 150)</td>
<td>Information available from: Project reports, Records of participation, Community surveys</td>
<td>Reviewer will review projects reports, records of participation and survey results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Construct Small-Scale Tourism Infrastructure</td>
<td>Number of infrastructures initiatives carried out</td>
<td>Target: 32 (8 X 4)</td>
<td>Information available from: Project reports, Construction contracts</td>
<td>Reviewer will view infrastructure projects where possible and assess project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Formation of tourism networks and stakeholder associations</td>
<td>Market research reports</td>
<td>Target: 4 (1/prov.), Target: 4 (1/prov.), Target: 16 (4/prov.), Target: 2</td>
<td>Information available from: Existence of reports, Existence of strategies/plans, Existence of promo</td>
<td>Reviewer will seek information from reports / strategies / plans and assess promo materials and records of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development of marketing strategies &amp; promotion</td>
<td>Marketing strategies and action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials plans</td>
<td>materials plans</td>
<td>materials plans</td>
<td>materials plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of maps, brochures, guidebooks, etc</td>
<td>- Number of maps, brochures, guidebooks, etc</td>
<td>- Records of participation</td>
<td>- Records of participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of shows attended</td>
<td>- Provincial tourism websites</td>
<td>- Number of shows attended</td>
<td>- Provincial tourism websites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total number of participants in activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Target: 4 (1/prov)</td>
<td>- Target: 640 (40/meeting X16 meetings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation of tourism networks and stakeholder associations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information available from:</td>
<td>Information available from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formation Agreements of Networks</td>
<td>- Formation Agreements of Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Records of participation in activities</td>
<td>- Records of participation in activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewer will review formation agreements and records of participation in activities.
### Part 3. Existing Results Diagram: Monitoring and Evaluation Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Tasks</th>
<th>Approach (methods, processes and tools)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Deliverables and Reporting</th>
<th>Indicative Cost</th>
<th>Reviewer's Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Collect baseline data</strong></td>
<td>- Primary from field survives and key informant interviews - Secondary data from existing reports</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>Lead: PCU, PIUs Support:</td>
<td>Project Baseline report, September</td>
<td>TA: 8 days Funding: $4,000 (USD), $5,195 NZD</td>
<td>Reviewer has this baseline data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Implement monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer's Comments**
- Reviewer has this baseline data
### Review Plan

**Review of the Community-Based Tourism for Sustainable Economic Development (CBT-SED) Project, Lao PDR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Collect required data</th>
<th>- Field notes, discussions with project staff and key informants - Prepare activity, quarterly and bi-annual reports</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Lead: PCU, PIUs Support:</th>
<th>Activity, quarterly, and bi-annual reports</th>
<th>TA: 8 days Funding: $4,000 (USD), $5,195 NZD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Evaluation** (Note – Evaluations must be based on the Rules and Standards in the soon-to-be released Evaluation Policy and Guidelines)

**Step 3: Undertake Evaluations** *(6-Month, Mid-Point and Project End)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 6-Month Evaluations</th>
<th>- Collectively review and discuss project implementation and results. - Record progress and note significant factors influencing implementation and results achieved.</th>
<th>Every 6 months</th>
<th>Lead: PCU, PIUs Support: MFAT</th>
<th>Overall project and activity workplans and 6-month project reporting</th>
<th>TA: 8 days Funding: $5,000 (USD), $6,494 NZD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reviewer has these reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2. Management Response</th>
<th>- Incorporate results into the workplan for the following planning period to strengthen ongoing project delivery</th>
<th>Every 6 months</th>
<th>Lead: PCU and MFAT Support: PIUs</th>
<th>Improvements reflected in subsequent workplan</th>
<th>TA: 2 days Funding:</th>
<th>Reviewer will assess whether this was done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 * Mid-point Evaluation (* If deemed necessary by MFAT)</td>
<td>- Review and discuss project implementation and results.</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>Lead: PCU and MFAT Support: PIUs</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation report</td>
<td>TA: 8 days Funding:</td>
<td>Reviewer has this reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Make changes if necessary - Decide on options for a subsequent project</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>Lead: PCU and MFAT Support: PIUs</td>
<td>- Improvements incorporated into project management and implementation approach if required</td>
<td>TA: 2 days Funding:</td>
<td>Reviewer will assess whether this was done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Project End Evaluation</td>
<td>- Review and discuss project implementation and results.</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>Lead: PCU and MFAT Support: PIUs</td>
<td>- Project end evaluation report</td>
<td>TA: 4 days</td>
<td>Funding: $3,000 (USD), $3,896 NZD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Management Response</td>
<td>- Decision on project’s success and the option for continuing support</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>Lead: PCU and MFAT</td>
<td>- Statement of project success and continuation possibilities</td>
<td>TA: 2 days</td>
<td>Funding: Current review and design work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information Collection

This table shows what information will be collected and how.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: To assess the relevance of the CBT-SED programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent does the activity continue to be relevant to beneficiaries, the New Zealand Aid Programme and partner country development priorities?</td>
<td>Perceptions of relevance</td>
<td>All project stakeholders</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent have the benefits from the activity addressed the needs of the different groups of stakeholders?</td>
<td>Perceptions of benefits</td>
<td>All project stakeholders</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent is the programme approach (community based tourism) relevant and appropriate to the context of the Lao tourism sector? Are there other approaches that are now more appropriate?</td>
<td>Perceptions of relevance and appropriateness</td>
<td>Any stakeholders willing to lift their sights above the project detail – especially high level officials, senior industry players, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2: To assess the effectiveness of the CBT-SED programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent have intended outcomes of the Activity been equitably achieved as a result of the activity?</td>
<td>Perceptions of equitable results</td>
<td>All project stakeholders</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What unintended outcomes (positive and negative) have occurred as a result of the activity?</td>
<td>Perceptions of unintended outcomes</td>
<td>All project stakeholders</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Information required</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What has constrained or enhanced the achievement of outcomes?</td>
<td>Explanations of constraints and enhancements</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How have the different risks and challenges that have emerged during the implementation of the project been managed?</td>
<td>Explanations of constraints and aids</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3: To assess the efficiency of the CBT-SED programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Have resources been used in the best areas, and in the best possible way, in order to provide value for money?</td>
<td>Perceptions of resource use and value for money</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the quality of partner and MFAT management (e.g., activity planning, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and risk management)?</td>
<td>Perceptions of partner and MFAT management</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the activity well-coordinated with other development support provided to the Lao tourism sector?</td>
<td>Perceptions of coordination and support</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4: To assess the sustainability of the CBT-SED programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the likelihood of continued long-term benefits after the activity has been completed?</td>
<td>Indications of real value to provincial, industry and community agendas</td>
<td>Private sector and community views, plus reviewer’s assessment</td>
<td>Field visits, consultations, and comparisons with other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent does the activity promote local ownership and develop local capacity?</td>
<td>Indications of local ownership and local capacity building</td>
<td>Private sector and community views, plus reviewer’s assessment</td>
<td>Field visits, consultations, and comparisons with other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 5: To assess the impact of the CBT-SED programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Information required</td>
<td>Information source</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What positive and negative impacts have resulted to date and are</td>
<td>Indications of positive and negative impacts</td>
<td>Private sector and community views, plus reviewer’s assessment</td>
<td>Field visits, consultations, and comparisons with other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely to result from the activity after it is completed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What would have happened without the activity?</td>
<td>Indications of change</td>
<td>Private sector and community views, plus reviewer’s assessment</td>
<td>Field visits, consultations, and comparisons with other projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 6: To assess the extent to which cross cutting issues have been addressed by the CBT-SED programme**

| 1. To what extent does the activity identify and promote gender equality and women’s empowerment? | Indicators of gender promotion and women’s empowerment | Project reports, project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals | Consultations, empathy, analysis |
| 2. To what extent does the activity protect and promote human rights? | Indicators of the activity protecting and promoting human rights | Project reports, project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals | Consultations, empathy, analysis |
| 3. To what extent does the activity protect the environment and manage environmental impacts and risks? | Indicators of the activity protecting the environment and managing environmental impacts and risks | Project reports, project overseers, project managers, partner donors, experienced aid professionals | Consultations, empathy, analysis |

**Objective 7: To make recommendations on the possible scope and direction of further New Zealand development assistance to the Lao tourism sector.**

| 1. How has the operating context (Lao tourism sector, local development needs, partner development plans and NZ development objectives) changed since the CBT-SED activity was designed, and how should these changes influence future New Zealand assistance? | Commentary on the changes that have occurred in the operating context | Project overseers, project managers, senior officials, partner donors, experienced aid professionals | Consultations, empathy, analysis |
2. What specific areas, sub-sectors and/or approaches should future New Zealand assistance target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on worthy new areas and approaches</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, senior officials, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Outline a proposed goal, key outcomes and indicative outputs in the format of a Results Diagram.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results diagram showing commentary on worthy new goals and outcomes and reviewer’s assessments</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, senior officials, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, assessment, visualisation, more consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Discuss the possible implementation arrangements for the new activity (e.g. the respective roles of key stakeholders – central and provincial government, private sector etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on possible new implementation arrangements</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, senior officials, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, assessment, visualisation, more consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What lessons learned from the existing activity can be incorporated in the new activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on lessons learned</td>
<td>Project overseers, project managers, senior officials, partner donors, experienced aid professionals</td>
<td>Consultations, empathy, assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 8: To prepare an Activity Design Document – subject to MFAT approval to proceed - based on agreed recommendations and scope.**

**Detailed Description of Review Methods**

The review work itself will begin with desk research to ensure a clear understanding of the background to the review. Briefings in Wellington and Bangkok will elicit the detail of current attitudes and opinions within MFAT.

This will be followed by briefing meetings and interviews with key stakeholder groups and individuals in Vientiane and at the project sites in the provinces. A list of interviewees is attached as Appendix B and a reviewer’s programme of interviews is attached as Appendix C.
All of these meetings will be conducted using professional empathy - based on past experience with MICT and its partners and familiarity with many similar projects - and practiced techniques of active listening. A framework of key questions is attached as Appendix A. The information gathered will be cross-checked by asking observers of the programme, particularly partner projects, partner donors and the private sector.

The rationale of this approach is to gather reliable information on perceptions of stakeholders with a view to comparing MFAT viewpoints with the attitudes and opinions of MICT and with the attitudes and opinions of other key stakeholder groups. Analysis of the results will aim to discover where perceptions align and where there are gaps in perception between groups.

Beyond this, the reviewer will rely on a practiced benchmarking approach, comparing the CBT-SED project – its approach, processes, outputs and outcomes – with many other projects of a similar nature that the reviewer has either designed, managed, reviewed or otherwise been associated with over many years in Asia and the Pacific. The reviewer will draw comparisons between the methods and apparent successes and failures of the CBT-SED programme with those of other similar projects. The aim of this benchmarking will be to establish gaps between the project and best practice elsewhere.

The reviewer will attempt to form judgements quickly, during the review period in the provinces. Findings and likely directions of the review recommendations will be shared in outline at the wrap up meetings openly and clearly. The aim of this will be to gauge reactions from the project stakeholders to the review judgements and likely new directions. Stakeholder reactions will inform further follow up investigations and analysis.

The draft report will then be compiled. The draft will:

- Make an assessment of the objectives, results and impact of the CBT-SED programme in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, mitigating factors, sustainability, impact and cross cutting issues of project activities.
- Provide commentary on whether or not an extension to the activity is recommended, and provide guidance as to potential future support to tourism in Lao PDR.
- Identify challenges and recommend ways and approaches for technical cooperation activities to address these.

After review by MFAT staff and stakeholders any revisions or alterations to the draft report negotiated and agreed with MFAT will be incorporated and the final report submitted.
Data/Information Analysis

Assistance will be sought from project personnel accompanying the reviewer in Vientiane and in the provinces to: i) compile a list of persons consulted; ii) gather attendance lists from all workshops; and iii) maintain a list of documents sighted.

Other than that, the reviewer will take personal responsibility for the recording of all qualitative information and for analysis of interview notes and all other information gathered.

Cross-Cutting Issues

The CBT-SED programme’s approach to gender equality, human rights and the environment will be assessed through consultations with experienced commentators, especially project overseers, project implementers, partner project managers, partner donors and other people with expertise and/or a wide perspective on these issues, coupled with the reviewer’s own insights and experience.

Ethical Considerations

The CBT-SED programme is at present dealing with government and private sector activity. The review is therefore unlikely to involve sensitive information from communities. In this regard there are not likely to be major ethical issues around how information is used, informed consent or possible harm from the use of information. The reviewer will offer and maintain confidentiality in any cases where a stakeholder suggests the information they are giving is sensitive. This may apply for example to criticism of the programme.

An overarching objective will be to engender ownership of the review outcomes by all stakeholders. For this reason, the reviewer’s general approach will be to share information and ideas freely. From the Lao government side, it is anticipated that officials will be keenly interested to inform the review. The degree of engagement of PTOs and provincial community stakeholders with the programme will be an important measure of progress.

When any other ethical issues arise, the reviewer’s approach will be to engage MFAT personnel in an interactive, mutually instructive way. MFAT personnel will be asked for input on all ethical considerations, using their up-to-date understanding of MFAT’s norms and attitudes. In this way the reviewer will ensure the review matches MFAT’s ethical standards.

An important broad ethical consideration will be that the genesis of MFAT’s involvement in tourism was around a very wholesome and
highly ethical developmental approach adopted by the Lao government. The approach was based on allowing free and independent tourist travel throughout Lao PDR but at the same time using government monitoring, pro-active planning and investments to ensure that the style of tourism that develops around the new tourist flows are wholesome and useful for the economic development of provincial communities. The question of whethere this development approach is still valid will be an underlying concern. The interest and concern of officials about the tourism value chain and its impacts on provincial communities will be an important measure in this regard.

Beyond this, the reviewer is being employed to act in a professional way with an independent viewpoint in the assessments and evaluations. Where questions of ethics arise they will be exposed and reported.

Limitations, Risks and Constraints

At this stage there are no serious risks, limitations or constraints envisaged. The two small concerns that have arisen in the process of preparing for the review are explained in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk/limitation/constraint</th>
<th>Likely effect on review</th>
<th>How this will be managed/mitigated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provinces having different levels of development and implementation of CBT-SED programme activities.</td>
<td>Some areas may not have reached the planned objectives and may not have concrete results to show</td>
<td>For this reason, all four provinces will be visited during the review. All four provincial stakeholders will be interviewed and current status reported on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a consequence of the above mitigation, the reviewer will have limited time in each province.</td>
<td>Immediate project stakeholders will be the focus of the visit. It may be difficult to see the wider context and to meet other stakeholders.</td>
<td>The reviewer will take every opportunity to understand the wider tourism context and to meet industry and community players. More attention will be paid to this in the design visit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback of Findings

While on the road the reviewer will prepare a Powerpoint presentation of key points arising from the review. This will be used at the wrap up meeting in Vientiane on 20 February. It will also be used on 21 February in the debriefing with the Post. A draft report will then be prepared and circulated for comment. Time has been allowed for feedback to be incorporated into the final report.
Documents to be Used in the Review

Documents already passed to the reviewer to be used in the review are:

- CBT-SED design documents
- CBT-SED programme progress reports
- Annual Monitoring Assessment reports for the CBT-SED programme
- IDG Strategy and Sector Priorities
- IDG Evaluation and Design Policies and Guidelines
- CBT-SED Project Results Diagram
- CBT-SED Project Results Framework
- Six-monthly progress report (01 April – 30 September 2011)
- Six-monthly progress report (01 April – 30 September 2012)
- Six-monthly progress report (01 October 2012 – March 2013)
- Six-monthly progress report (01 April 2013 – 30 September 2013)
- CBT-SED annual progress report (01 April 2012 – 31 March 2013)
- 5th financial acquittal report (14/11/13) - latest status of project expenditure.
- CBT-SED Baseline report
- Justification letter requesting additional funds (21/04/13)
- CBT-SED Grant Funding Arrangement (Original – January 20)
- CBT-SED GFA Variation No 1
- CBT-SED GFA Variation No 2
- CBT-SED GFA Variation No 3

Timeline

This table shows the timing of key activities and deliverables for the review. A detailed programme of in-countries activities is attached as Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key activity</th>
<th>Deliverable (output)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background research and MFAT briefing</td>
<td>Review plan</td>
<td>10 February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing at NZ Embassy, Bangkok, field work in Lao PDR, briefings and interviews</td>
<td>Draft Review Report</td>
<td>28 February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final revisions and feedback</td>
<td>Final Review Report</td>
<td>7 March 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix A: Questions for Interviews and Workshops

As appropriate in Asia, questions will be set in the context of polite and formal conversations. Questions will vary in style and form according to the context and the people in the conversation. The reviewer will call on years of experience to judge how best to approach each interview and each workshop.

In all cases the reviewer will listen to explanations of programme activities, outputs and outcomes. The reviewer will then ask probing question around seeking views on:

- Perceptions of value around the objectives, results and impact of the CBT-SED programme?
- relevance of the programme?
- efficiency of the programme?
- effectiveness of the programme?
- mitigating factors involved?
- sustainability of the programme outcomes?
- impacts and cross cutting issues?

In some cases the reviewer will share ideas around the status of review and seek the views of interviewee on:

- Is an extension to the programme justifiable?
- What new directions should be taken in future support to tourism in Lao PDR?
- What should be in the terms of reference for the design of a new phase of support?
- What are the challenges likely to be involved and ways to overcome them?

Appendix B: Proposed Interviewees

**Project Coordination Unit (PCU)**

- Mr Sounh Manvivong, Director, Tourism Development Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism
- Mr Thaviphet Oula, Deputy Director of Tourism Development Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, CBT-SED Programme Director thaviphet@yahoo.com
- Mr Bounpheng Souliyanon, Director of Ecotourism Division, MoICT, CBT-SED Programme Manager yaliboun@yahoo.com
-Mrs Vilaphanh LuangAphay, Director of Financial Division, Financial Controller

-Ms Acksonexay Rasttanavong, National Team Leader acksonsay@gmail.com

-Mr Douglas Hainsworth, Former International Team Leader douglas.hainsworth@gmail.com

- Ms. Taryn Bodrug, Volunteer (since June 2013) taryn.bodrug@gmail.com

**Project Implementation Units (PIUs)**

- Mr Phonesavath Kamonthong, Programme Director, Luang Namtha

- Mrs Sommala Thomvisay, Programme Manager, Luang Namtha

- Mr Khampheth Phommadueangkaisone, Programme Director, Xieng Khouang xkhtour@yahoo.com

- Mr Sivilay Oudomsouk, Programme Manager, Xieng Khouang xkhtour@yahoo.com

- Mr Panya Chanthalath, Programme Director, Khammouane

- Mr Manothong Phongsavath, Programme Manager, Khammouane

- Ms Khamyong Chommanivong, Programme Director, Bolikhamxay

- Mr Somsy Chanthamixay, Programme Manager, Bolikhamxay

**Other stakeholders**

- Mr Steven Schipani, Social Sector Specialist, ADB, Thailand sschipani@adb.org

- Mr Rick Ponne, ADB Laos rikponne@gmail.com

- Dr Liliane C. Ortega, Deputy Country Director, SDC Laos, Frist Secretary Development and Cooperation, SDC liliane.ortega@sdc.net

- Takei Koichi, Chief Representative, JICA Takei.koichi@jica.go.jp

- Dr. Hans Peter Kueppers, First Secretary, Head of Development Cooperation, GIZ wz-1@vien.auswaertiges-amt.de

- Mr Richard North, Product Manager, Stray Travel Richard@straytravel.asia

- Mr. Inthy Deuansavan, Founder of Green Discovery Laos, intthy@greendiscoverylaos.com

- Mr. Marcus Neuer, Director & “Fair Trek” Founder markus@laos-adventures.com

- Ms. Douangmala, Director of Laos Exotissimo
Appendix C: Proposed programme of interviews and workshops

Monday 10 February 2014
10:30  - Briefing meeting with Brent Rapson and Romchalee Ngamwitoj, NZ Embassy Bangkok
16.00 - Meeting with Stephen Schipani, ADB, Bangkok

Tuesday 11 February 2014

Wednesday, 12 February 2014
8:30-10:00 - Kick-off with Mr. Sounh Manivong, Mr. Thavipheth Oula and PCU members on the overall implementation of CBT-SED Programme.
10:00-12:00 - Meeting with PCU and the three Departments of CBT-SED (Tourism Development, Marketing, and Tourism Management)
13:30-15:00 - Stakeholder meeting (public and private sector) which includes the PCU, the three Departments, Tourism Training Center, Green Discovery and Exotissimo.
15:00-16:00 - Meeting with Mr. Rick Ponne

Thursday, 13 February 2014
Meetings have been arranged with the following people:
8:00-9:30 - Dr. Liliane
10:00-11:30 - Mr. Takei
13:00-14:30 - Dr. Hans
15:00-16:30 - Mr. Richard
(meetings are not yet confirmed)

Friday, 14 February 2014
9:00-10:00 - Meeting with Mr. Inthy
14:30-15:30 - Travel from Vientiane to Luang Namtha by air
16:30-18:00 - Visit the National CBT Training Center and the Night Market

Saturday, 15 February 2014
8:30-10:30 - Meeting with PIU Luang Namtha
10:30-12:00 - Meet private sector (tour guide units) who are supported by the programme.
Please note that for field trips to target villages, we leave it for design phase.

16:00-17:00 - Fly from Luang Namtha to Vientiane

**Sunday, 16 February 2014**

14:50-15:20 - Travel from Vientiane to Xiengkhouang by plane

16:00-18:30 - Visit Plain of Jars Visitor Center and Xiengkhaoung Product Exhibition Center.

**Monday, 17 February 2014**

8:00-10:00 - Meeting with PIU Xiengkhouang

10:00-14:00 - Visit Xang village Hotspring

16:00-16:30 - Fly to Vientiane

**Tuesday, 18 February 2014**

7:00-13:00 - Travel from Vientiane to Khammouane by car

14:00-15:00 - Meet with PIU Khammouane

15:00-17:00 - Assess the progress on the construction of tourist facilities around the Buddha cave and visit organic vegetable farm supported by the programme.

**Wednesday, 19 February 2014**

7:00-12:00 - Assess activities implemented in Konglor cave area and visit organic vegetable farm supported by the programme.

13:00-15:00 - Travel from Konglor to Paksan

15:00-17:00 - Meeting with PIU Bolikhamxay and visit CBT Visitor Center

19:00 - Stay overnight in Paksan

**Thursday, 20 February 2014**

8:00-10:00 - Assess supply chain products at Thongyai village

10:00-15:00 - Assess activities implemented at Yangkua, Ban Na, Thaphonsan villages and Thadsai waterfall.

15:00 - 16:00 - Travel to Vientiane

16:00-17:30 - Wrap-up meeting

21:40 - Les Clark flies to Bangkok for debriefing meeting.

**Friday 21 February 2014**

10:00 - Debriefing meeting with Brent Rapson and Romchalee Ngamwitroj, NZ Embassy Bangkok
Appendix C: Interviewees during the review

12 February 2014

Project Coordinator Unit (PCU):

Mr. Souh Manivong, Director, Tourism Development Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism
Tel: (+856 20 5529 0101)
Email: sounhmv@yahoo.com

Mr. Thavipheth Oula, Deputy Director of Tourism Development Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, CBT-SED Program Director
Tel: (+856 20 55777947)
Email: thaviphet@yahoo.com

Mr. Bounpheng Souliyanon, Director of Ecotourism Division, MIOCT, CBT-SED Program Manager
Tel: (+856 20 2216 6666)
Email: yaliboun@yahoo.com

Mrs. Viraphanh Luangaphay, Director of Finance Division, Financial Controller
Tel: (+856 20 2241 2999)
Email: viraphan@yahoo.com

Mrs. Viengvilasay Vilaychaleun, Chief of Section, Ecotourism Division, MIOCT, CBT-SED Program Accountant
Tel: (+856 20 5477 5038)
Email: viengvilaxay@gmail.com

Ms. Souknilun Yavong, Program Assistant
Tel: (+856 20 2225 9592)
Email: nilun1990@hotmail.com

Mr. Souphalack Matmanivong, Program Coordinator
Tel: (+856 20 7761 5163)
Email: luck.mathmanivong@gmail.com

Mrs. Acksonexay Rattanavong, National Team Leader
Tel: (+856 20 2222 8335)
Email: acksonsay@gmail.com

Ms. Taryn Bodrug, Volunteer
Tel: (+856 20 )
Email: taryn.bodrug@gmail.com

Focalpoints for the three Departments
Mrs. Champhone Vongsa, Deputy Director of Tourism Planning and Development Division, Tourism Development Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism.
Tel: (+856 20 2222 7473)
Email: champhonejui@yahoo.com

Mr. Vongdeuan Keosulivong, Chief of Section, Tourism Marketing Research Division, Tourism Marketing Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism.
Tel: (+856 20 5444 9414)
Email: lejek@yahoo.com

Mr. Bounsert Xayaseng, Chief of Section, Accommodation Management Division, Tourism Management Department, Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism.
Tel: (+856 20 5531 3208)
Email: xbounsert@ymail.com

Other stakeholders:
Mr. Rick Ponne, Internation Team Leader, ADB
Tel: (+856 20 )
Email: rikponne@gmail.com

Mr. Inthy Deuansavan, Founder of Green Discovery Laos
Tel: (+856 20 )
Email: inthy@greendiscovery@laos.com

Adrian from HDC Lao (Swiss)  (TBC)
PCU Team (TBC)
Dr. Hans - DIZ (GTZ and DED) (TBC)
Kirsten FOCHEN  (TBC)
Richard North – Stray Travel (based in Luang Prabang) by Skype. (TBC)

15 February 2014

PIU Luang Namtha
Mr.Phonesavat KHAMONTHONG
Director of PIU
Luang Namtha+85620 2394 3222
2Mrs. Sommala HOMVISAYManager/PIU Luang Namtha+85620 2239 2222
houmvisay@yahoo.com

Mr.Somsavath NAMINTHA
Accouting/PIU Luang Namtha+85620 9944 0084
coo_vath@hotmail.com

Mr.Linthone SOUVANTHONE
Finance / PIU Luang Namtha
+85620 2244 3961thone.svt@hotmail.com

Ms. Motnaly MINGMAUNGCordinator/ PIU Luang Namtha+85620 2890 0047modnaty@hotmail.com

Private Sector Luang Namtha
Mr. Vanxai INYASONE (Xai)
Trekking , Kayaking/Rafting. Homestay/Camping,Hotel & Other Service
Mobile: +85620 2299 0344
Tel/Fax: +856 86 212 047
E-mail: vanxai1983@gmail.com
info@discoveringlaos.com
Website: Discoveringlaos.com, Namtha-river-experience-laos.com

Mr. Khambay XONSOUMPHOU
Manager of ethmic
Mobile: +85620 2299 0069

Mr. Chanthaphone
Manager of Greendiscovery
Mobile: +85620 2891 2828
e-mail: namtha@greendiscoverylaos.com

Mr. Seethon
Manager of Into the Wild
Mobile: +85620 9555 3775

16-17 February 2014.

Xiengkhouang Implementation Unit (PIU)

Mr. Khampheth Phommadueangkaisone, Director of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of Xiengkhouang, Director of CBT-SED Programme at Provincial level (Project Implementation Unit or PIU)

Mr. Sivilay Oudomsouk, Deputy Director of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of Xiengkhouang, Manager of CBT-SED Programme at Provincial level (Project Implementation Unit or PIU)

Mr. Sorsisoulin Bounyatham, Programme Coordinator
Ms. Khankham Chommalavong, Financial Officer
Ms. Vongphet Nanthavong, Accountant

Xang Hot Spring’s Villagers

Mr. Khamphanh, Head of Xang Hot Spring Village
Mr. Khamman, Deputy Head of Xang Hot Spring Village
Mrs. Sod, Community Lodge and Restaurant Group
Mrs. Not, Handicraft Group
Mr. Khammy, Massage Group

Plain of Jars Visitor Center

Mr. Bounmy Phimmasone, Technical Staff

Mr. Somphanh Douangpasert, Technical Staff

Tourist Information Center and Local Product Exhibit Center

Ms. Ket Manivone, Technical Staff

17 Feb 2014.

Khammuan Implementation Unit (PIU)

Mr. Panya Chanthalath, Deputy Director of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of Khammuan, Director of CBT-SED Programme at Provincial level (Project Implementation Unit or PIU)
Mobile: +85620 2232 6444
E-mail: panyachanthalath@yahoo.com

Mr. Manothong Phongsavath,
Manager of CBT-SED Programme at Provincial level (Project Implementation Unit or PIU)
Mobile: +85620 2217 1777
E-mail: Thongphongsavath@yahoo.com

Ms. Phoxay Simoukda, Financial Officer
Mobile: +85620 2841 2288
E-mail: simoukdap@yahoo.com

Mrs. Phetsila Norlavath, Accountant
Activity Evaluation Report

Document ID:

Mobile: +85620 5595 9185
E-mail: phetsilan@yahoo.com

Mr. Kanta Sayahan, Programme Coordinator
Mobile: +85620 2232 8217
E-mail: chouk408@yahoo.com

Kong lor’s Villagers
Mr. Somphong, Head of Kong lor village
Mobile: +85620 5416 0200
Mr. Saly Thongsavah, Deputy Head of Kong lor village
Mobile: +85620 5477 7715
E-mail: Salycave@yahoo.com

19 Feb 2014.

Mr. Lamsamay Volasane, Director of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of Bolikhamxay
Mobile: +85620 2233 5556
E-mail: Lamsamyy@mail.com

Bolikhamxay Implementation Unit (PIU)
Mrs. Khamgnong Chommanyvong, Deputy Director of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of Bolikhamxay,
Director of CBT-SED Programme at Provincial level (Project Implementation Unit or PIU)
Mobile: +85620 2282 8696

Mr. Somsy Chanthamixay, Deputy Director of Department of Information, Culture and Tourism of Bolikhamxay,
Manager of CBT-SED Programme at Provincial level (Project Implementation Unit or PIU)
Mobile: +85620 2233 7085

Mr. Saikham Panyanouvong, Financial Officer
Mobile: +85620 2211 8882  
E-mail: saikham_mst@hotmail.com  

Mr. Bounkham Phomnouin, Accountant  
Mobile: +85620 2282 1988  
E-mail: bunkam@live.com  

Mr. Pany Thepsombath, Programme Coordinator  
Mobile: +85620 23423123  

**Villagers**  
Mr. Somsadath, Head of Tha Phonsun village  
Mobile: +85620 2243 1062  

Mr. Khammao, Head of Ban Na village  
Mobile: +85620 2211 8262
Appendix D: Reviewer’s field Programme

Tuesday 11 February 2014

20:55  - Mr. Les Clark arrives in Vientiane.

Wednesday, 12 February 2014

8:30-10:00  - Kick-off with Mr. Sounh Manivong, Mr. Thavipheth Oula and PCU members on the overall implementation of CBT-SED Programme.

10:00-12:00  - Meeting with PCU and the three Departments of CBT-SED (Tourism Development, Marketing, and Tourism Management)

13:30-15:00  - Stakeholder meeting (public and private sector) which includes the PCU, the three Departments, Tourism Training Center, Green Discovery and Exotissimo – Mr Inthy

15:00-16:00  - Meeting with Mr Rick Ponne

Thursday, 13 February 2014

7.30 Pick up Dhavara

8:00-9:30  - Adrian from HDC Lao (Swiss)

10:00-11:30  – PCU

16:30  - Dr. Hans  - DIZ (GTZ and DED) Kirsten FOCHEN

Mr. Richard North – Stray Travel (based in Luang Prabang) by Skype.

Friday, 14 February 2014

14:30-15:30  - Travel from Vientiane to Luang Namtha by air (the flight is confirmed)

16:30-18:00  - Visit the National CBT Training Center and the Night Market

Saturday, 15 February 2014

8:30-10:30  - Meeting with PIU Luang Namtha
10:30-12:00 - Meet private sector (tour guide units) who are supported by the programme.

16:00-17:00 - Fly from Luang Namtha to Vientiane

Sunday, 16 February 2014

14:50-15:20 - Travel from Vientiane to Xiengkhouang by plane

16:00-18:30 - Visit Plain of Jars Visitor Center and Xiengkhaoung Product Exhibition Center.

Monday, 17 February 2014

8:00-10:00 - Meeting with PIU Xiengkhouang
10:00-14:00 - Visit Xang village Hotspring
16:00-16:30 - Fly to Vientiane

Tuesday, 18 February 2014

7:00-13:00 - Travel from Vientiane to Khammouane by car
14:00-15:00 - Meet with PIU Khammouane
15:00-17:00 - Assess the progress on the construction of tourist facilities around the Buddha cave and visit organic vegetable farm supported by the programme.

Wednesday, 19 February 2014

7:00-12:00 - Assess activities implemented in Konglor cave area and visit organic vegetable farm supported by the programme.
13:00-15:00 - Travel from Konglor to Paksan
15:00-17:00 - Meeting with PIU Bolikhamxay and visit CBT Visitor Center
19:00 - Stay overnight in Paksan

Thursday, 20 February 2014

8:00-10:00 - Assess supply chain products at Thongyai village
10:00-15:00 - Assess activities implemented at Yangkua, Ban Na, Thaphonsan villages and Thadsai waterfall.
15:00-16:00 - Travel to Vientiane (Wrap up on the go)

21:40 - Mr. Les Clark flies to Bangkok for debriefing meeting.
Appendix E: List of Data Sources

This appendix contains a list of data sources used in the evaluation.

- CBT-SED design documents
- CBT-SED programme progress reports
- Annual Monitoring Assessment reports for the CBT-SED programme
- IDG Strategy and Sector Priorities
- IDG Evaluation and Design Policies and Guidelines
- CBT-SED Project Results Diagram
- CBT-SED Project Results Framework
- Six-monthly progress report (01 April – 30 September 2011)
- Six-monthly progress report (01 April – 30 September 2012)
- Six-monthly progress report (01 October 2012 – March 2013)
- Six-monthly progress report (01 April 2013 – 30 September 2013)
- CBT-SED annual progress report (01 April 2012 – 31 March 2013)
- 5th financial acquittal report (14/11/13) - latest status of project expenditure.
- CBT-SED Baseline report
- Justification letter requesting additional funds (21/04/13)
- CBT-SED Grant Funding Arrangement (Original – January 20)
- CBT-SED GFA Variation No 1
- CBT-SED GFA Variation No 2
- CBT-SED GFA Variation No 3
Glossary of Acronyms

The following acronyms are used in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asia Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>community-based tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT-SED</td>
<td>community-based tourism for sustainable economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICT</td>
<td>(Lao) Department of Information, Culture and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIT</td>
<td>Free and independent travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>gross domestic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>Greater Mekong Subregion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>Grant Funding Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>German Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>human resource development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperations Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICT</td>
<td>Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFAT</td>
<td>(New Zealand) Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES&amp;AP</td>
<td>National Ecotourism Strategy and Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTO -</td>
<td>national tourism organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>National Tourism Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>(NZ) Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCU</td>
<td>Project Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIU</td>
<td>Project Implementation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Swiss Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>Netherlands Development Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCAP</td>
<td>United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>