



Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Thailand

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

9558

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

Project Title

Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Thailand

Countries

Thailand

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s):

UNOPS

Executing Partner Type

GEF Agency

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Influencing models, Stakeholders, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Integrated Programs, Commodity Supply Chains, Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration, Sustainable Cities, Food Security in Sub-Sahara Africa, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Demonstrate innovative approach, Local Communities, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Women groups, Gender-sensitive indicators, Beneficiaries, Deforestation-free Sourcing, Financial Screening Tools, Soybean Supply Chain, Sustainable Commodities Production, High Conservation Value Forests, High Carbon Stocks Forests, Beef Supply Chain, Smallholder Farmers, Oil Palm Supply Chain, Adaptive Management, Integrated urban planning, Energy efficiency, Green space, Buildings, Urban Resilience, Urban sustainability framework, Transport and Mobility, Global Platform for Sustainable Cities, Municipal waste management, Urban Biodiversity, Urban Food Systems, Municipal Financing, Deforestation-free Sourcing, Landscape Restoration, Food Value Chains, Comprehensive Land Use Planning, Sustainable Food Systems, Smallholder Farming, Sustainable Commodity Production, Integrated Landscapes, Resilience to climate and shocks, Sustainable Production Systems, Integrated Land and Water Management, Crop Genetic Diversity, Small and Medium Enterprises, Agroecosystems, Land and Soil Health, Gender Dimensions, Diversified Farming, Multi-stakeholder Platforms, Capacity Development

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

36In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

226,254

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-4_P9	Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management	GET	885,360	2,010,781
CCM-2_P4	Outcome A. Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration	GET	885,360	2,010,781
LD-3_P4	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs	GET	610,900	1,387,438
Total Project Cost(\$)			2,381,620	5,409,000

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To enable community organizations in four diverse regions of Thailand to take collective action for adaptive landscape and seascape management for socio-ecological resilience - through design, implementation and evaluation of grant projects for global environmental benefits and sustainable development

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Resilient rural landscapes and seascapes for sustainable development and global environmental protection	Technical Assistance	1.1. Multistakeholder partnerships in pilot landscapes and seascapes of four diverse regions – 1) mountainous Northern region, 2) dry plateau of Northeastern, 3) lower basin of Central region, and 4) coastal area of Southern region - develop and execute adaptive management plans to enhance landscape/seascape and community resilience, and global environmental benefits. 1.2. Community organizations in landscape/seascape level networks build their adaptive management capacities by implementing	1.1.1 Formal multistakeholder groups organized for each landscape 1.1.2 Formal multistakeholder agreements agreed and signed regarding long term outcomes for each landscape 1.1.3 Participatory research and planning processes instituted leading to comprehensive socio-ecological baseline assessments 1.1.4 Landscape and seascape strategies developed by multistakeholder groups 1.1.5 Typology of community level projects developed and agreed by multistakeholder groups together with eligibility criteria 1.2.1 Community level	GET	2,268,210	5,139,550

<p>community level projects and collaborating in managing landscape resources and processes to achieve socio ecological production landscape resiliency. 1.3. Multistakeholder landscape and seascape management groups, local policy makers and subnational/national advisors organized in landscape policy platforms discuss potential policy innovations based on analysis of project experience and lessons learned. 1.4. Multistakeholder partnerships develop and implement strategic projects to bring adoption of specific successful SGP-supported technologies, practices or systems to a tipping point in each landscape through engagement of potential financial partners, policy makers and national/subnational advisors and</p>	<p>small grant projects in the selected landscapes and seascapes that conserve biodiversity and enhance ecosystem services: co-management of protected areas; watershed management; non-timber forest products, sustainable fisheries; others. 1.2.2 Community level small grant projects in the selected landscapes that enhance productivity and sustainability of smallholder agroecosystems: participatory vulnerability assessments; agroecological techniques/practices such as polycultures, cover crops, agroforestry systems, crop genetic resource conservation; others 1.2.3 Community level small grant projects in the selected landscapes that innovate alternative livelihood options and improve market access: value addition to agroecological</p>
---	--

institutions, as well as the private sector. products; ecotourism; market access; others

1.2.4 Community level small grant projects in the selected landscapes that mitigate climate-related risks to health and well-being: demonstration of energy efficiency/renewable energy applications (biomass efficient stoves, biogas, solar energy, micro-hydro, etc.); waste management for energy and improved carbon sequestration/storage

. 1.3.1 Multisectoral policy dialogue platforms organized for each landscape/seascape and one dialogue platform organized nationally

1.3.2 Relevant project and portfolio experiences systematized and codified for dissemination to policy platform participants as well as community organizations and networks, as well as second level organizations

1.4.1

Detailed analysis of successful grant project portfolios and lines of work (e.g. crop genetic resource conservation) to identify lessons learned/best practice and market opportunities 1.4.2 Engagement of potential financial partners and public sector institutions as viable in analysis and planning 1.4.3 Based on the detailed analysis, identification of upscaling requirements and opportunities, and development of a strategy(ies) to enable and facilitate upscaling 1.4.4 Strategic projects (up to USD 150,000) that implement strategies enabling and facilitating upscaling of the identified portfolios and lines of work: e.g. management of river basins using Ridge-to-Reef or Forested Upland down-to-Delta approaches; broader adoption of energy technology applications

	Sub Total (\$)	2,268,210	5,139,550
Project Management Cost (PMC)			
	GET	113,410	269,450
	Sub Total(\$)	113,410	269,450
	Total Project Cost(\$)	2,381,620	5,409,000

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
CSO	Grantee organization	In-kind	1,300,000
CSO	Grantee Organization	Grant	200,000
Government	Land Development Department	Grant	1,910,000
Government	Royal Forest Department	Grant	1,500,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	147,000
CSO	IUCN	Grant	352,000
Total Co-Financing(\$)			5,409,000

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Thailand	Biodiversity		No	885,360	84,109
UNDP	GET	Thailand	Climate Change		No	885,360	84,109
UNDP	GET	Thailand	Land Degradation		No	610,900	58,036
Total Grant Resources(\$)						2,381,620	226,254

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

PPG Amount (\$)

75,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

7,125

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Thailand	Biodiversity		No	27,880	2,650
UNDP	GET	Thailand	Climate Change		No	27,880	2,650
UNDP	GET	Thailand	Land Degradation		No	19,240	1,825
Total Project Costs(\$)						75,000	7,125

Core Indicators

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	31000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	31,000.00		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

--	--	--	--

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

--	--	--	--

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Submitted

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	0	3400700	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)		3400700		
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting		2038		
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)				

Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)
Anticipated start year of accounting
Duration of accounting

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		4,320		

Male		5,280		
Total	0	9600	0	0

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

There are no significant changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF. In the course of project preparation the project landscapes were more precisely defined but remain in the original regions identified in the PIF. The overall amount of co-financing declined somewhat from the amount originally stated in the PIF given the long lag time from first submission and technical approval of the PIF to final Council approval (approximately 12-14 months). During this lag time, a number of donor capacities changed, and they could no longer support the Project at the level originally envisaged. Co-financing is now approximately 2:1, which is well over the standard cofinancing ratio for SGP (1:1). Consistent with past SGP practice, cofinancing will be continuously sought during the course of project implementation as opportunities arise.

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

Please see Annex E, Gender Analysis and Action Plan on page 94 of the Project Document.

A key issue at landscape level is land ownership inequality between women and men in some of the target landscapes, especially in ethnic minority communities. Experience also indicates that women appear to care about the environment and participate in its conservation because they rely on forest, land and water for their living. Women often have good knowledge of medicinal plants, as well as a strong volunteer spirit and are committed to their roles in conservation and community services. Increasing number of women are engaged in community work and some as leaders, with some exhibiting good negotiation and persuasion skills more than men. Most of the community-based savings groups are run by women as they have experience managing household budgets. Therefore, existing women's strengths/capacities can be potentially further enhanced through implementation of their grant projects. These strengths are counted as factors which could help improve effectiveness and efficiency of implementation should women be more actively and equally engaged. Examples of key strengths are women's coordination and mediator skills, traditional knowledge, volunteer spirit, commitment, honesty, financial management ability, and decisiveness.

The SGP Country Program will enjoy the collaboration of a variety of government institutions depending on the target landscape. Institutions such as the Ministry of Natural Resources Management and Environment (MoNRE), Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MoAC), Ministry of Interior (MI), and Ministry of Education (ME), whose work will support implementation of sustainable landscape/seascape management in the four target regions, are expected, as a matter of public policy, to have gender mainstreaming action plans in place. These plans should align with the current National Socio-Economic Development Plan, National Gender Development Plan, and the Departmental Operational Plan. Some examples of sectoral gender mainstreaming plans include;

- Development of a ministerial gender master plan
- Development of gender-disaggregated database to be used in project/programme planning, monitoring and evaluation
- Promotion of genuine participation of women beneficiaries in MoNRE's programmes/ activities
- Establishment of internal and external networks to promote gender equality
- Application of non-gender discrimination principles/approach in agricultural programme planning and implementation across the board
- Awareness raising of authorities on gender equality issues

SGP will support these institutions to comply with gender policy as part of their collaborative partnerships in the distinct target landscapes.

Based on the gender analysis undertaken during project preparation, this project will also carry out activities under the gender action plan to ensure that:

1) Implementation to achieve the resilience outcomes in each target landscape/seascape will include mainstreaming gender equality principles through the following steps.

- Awareness raising of stakeholders on gender inequality issues and the need for gender mainstreaming in project activities;
- Building capacity of the CBOs/NGOs engaged in the implementation of grant projects in gender analysis, gender-responsive/mainstreaming planning, implementation and monitoring;
- Based on the findings from the landscape resilience assessment, identification of gender-related impacts to:

- o understand different impacts of the changes in the landscape on women and men;
- o establish sex-disaggregated data base
- o develop gender responsive/gender mainstreaming actions/activities based on gender-disaggregated data to address problems/issues in landscape management under the four resilience outcomes
- o identify gender-specific indicators to establish baseline against which the improvements from implementation are measured through regular monitoring
- Documentation/reflection of lessons learned on gender mainstreaming practices in sustainable landscape management in relation to impact/changes on women's life; good practices; and challenges

2) Work towards attitude and behavioral changes towards gender equality at household, community and landscape levels. Activities could include, for example:

- Awareness raising on gender inequality issues among stakeholders.
- Organization of a platform where participants discuss roles of women and men in the changing world/environment and see how the changing roles could complement each other to bridge the gender gaps
- Support to women' increasing leadership roles especially in activities that require their skills/knowledge

3) Engagement of a gender specialist to provide advice within the Country Program regarding gender-related activities.

Documents	Title	Submitted
-----------	-------	-----------

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

See Annex E of the Project Document.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

Please see Annex C, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure on page 74 of the Project Document

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Please see Section VIII, Governance and Management Arrangements on page 51 of the Project Document.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptaion benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

This project supports the achievement of global environmental benefits through promotion of landscape management processes and community initiatives predicated on the principle – based on SGP experience - that global environmental benefits can be produced and maintained through community-based sustainable development projects. Previous phases of the SGP Thailand Country Programme have identified and promoted clear win-win opportunities with community initiatives and clusters of initiatives in areas such as rural energy (biomass, biogas, solar energy and micro-hydro), sustainable transport, energy efficiency, sustainable use of biodiversity (medicinal plants, ecotourism) and water resource management (including efficient irrigation). Landscape planning and management processes will be enhanced through the formation of multistakeholder partnerships, involving local government, national agencies and institutions, CSOs, the private sector and others at the landscape level and the adoption of multistakeholder partnership agreements to pursue specific landscape level outcomes through grant projects producing socio-economic benefits that sustain GEB.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Each SGP grant project is designed to produce three things: global environmental and local sustainable development benefits; organizational capacities (technical, analytical, etc.) from learning by doing; and knowledge from evaluation of the innovation experience. In the case of knowledge, each grant project will have as a primary product a case study or summary of lessons learned based on evaluation of implementation results and their contributions to GEB, local development objectives and landscape level outcomes, including the development of social capital. This knowledge will be further systematized and codified for dissemination at the landscape level through policy dialogue platforms, community landscape management networks and multistakeholder partnerships, and knowledge fairs and other exchanges; at the national level through the National Steering Committee, strategic partnerships and their networks, and national knowledge fairs where appropriate; and globally through the SGP global network of SGP Country Programs and UNDP's knowledge management system. Please see the KM plan including timeline, products and resources on pages 51-53 of the Project Document.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:**B.1. Consistency with National Priorities**

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

Please see sub-section Consistency with National Priorities on page 21 of the Project Document.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

Please see Section VII, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan on pages 46-50 of the Project Document.

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Adriana Dinu		Diana Salvemini	(212) 906-5094	diana.salvemini@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please see pages 38-45 of the Project Document.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

No comments received from GEF Council.

No comments received from GEF Agencies.

Comments from GEFSec at PIF approval stage have been responded to; no responses pending at CEO Endorsement stage.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To Date	Amount Committed
Technical Studies	27,000	26,989	0
Formuation of ProDoc, CEO-ER, etc.	17,000	16,983	0
Validation Workshop	4,500	4,500	0
Community Outreach Workshop	4,500	4,500	0
Constultant Travel	8,000	7,791	0
Stakeholder Travel	14,000	13,985	0
Total	75,000	74,748	0

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

See Annex L on pages 149-153 of the Project Document.

ANNEX F: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Completed

ANNEX G: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.