Implementation Plan of Recommendations

Project Title and Reference No.: 10268

Contact Person (TM/PM): Kavita Sharma

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	**ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)**	**WHAT WILL BE DONE?**	**EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE**	**REPONSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY**
Enhance Data Collection, Monitoring and Reporting: Finalize the Results Framework with coherent **baselines and SMART indicators/targets** to improve performance tracking.	Partially	Update the baselines, where applicable, with information being collected by project partners. Include these in next round of reporting (PIR and HYPR)	Q4 2025	EA and partners; UNEP TM
Accelerate Private Sector Engagement: Facilitate stronger participation of **agribusiness investors and market players**.	Yes	Engage more with private sector partners	Ongoing – end of the project	EA
Expand Knowledge Management Strategies: Strengthen **digital**	Partially	Explore synergies with GCF online learning and communications, and if applicable, implement.	Ongoing – end of the project	EA

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	**ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)**	**WHAT WILL BE DONE?**	**EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE**	**REPONSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY**
platforms for knowledge sharing and outreach.				
Encourage carbon credit initiatives under UNFCCC and/or voluntary carbon markets, though these should remain separate from the core project outputs.	No	This is beyond the scope of the project	N/A	N/A
Study and implement measures to improve provincial level coordination.	Yes	Study best practices and transfer lessons learned from Ubon Ratchathani to Chaing Rai.	Q4 2025	EA
Transfer more budget resources to field resources, to strengthen local level farmer integration (including indigenous hill tribes) with gender participation.	Partially	Explore ways in which budget can be reallocated to strengthen field activities, if this does not impinge on other activities	Q3 2025	EA; UNEP TM
No-Cost Extension Given the project delays, request extension of the project period with one year to ensure that project objectives are met	Yes	Process a NCE for the project	Q3 2025	EA; UNEP TM

The following is a summary of lessons learned from some of the project's experiences and based upon explicit findings of the review. They briefly describe the context from which the lessons are derived, and the potential for wider application:

B.

Lesson Learned #1:	**Strong alignment with the national government and its policies** increases expectation of project impact and sustainability
Context/comment:	One of the main strengths of the project that gives expectation of impact of sustainability is the strong alignment with national policies, strategies, and institutional framework.

Lesson Learned #2:	**Early engagement with key stakeholders is essential** to avoid bureaucratic delays.
Context/comment:	A significant reason for the delays in project implementation is not having agreed with IRRI and SRP on the main terms of partnership before the project started.

Lesson Learned #3:	**Risk mitigation and adaptive project management is critical** to accommodate changing circumstances.
Context/comment:	External factors such as COVID-19 and unexpected national elections, as well as changing national partners' priorities because of the long period that had passed, made it necessary to adjust project activities.

Lesson Learned #4:	**Strengthening private sector partnerships** enhances the scalability of sustainable rice practices
Context/comment:	The private sector partners are interested in scaling up the project outcomes, especially certification of sustainable rice products through the national Q brand and the international SRP certificate.

Lesson Learned #5:	**High quality Results Framework** enhances project planning, monitoring and evaluation.
Context/comment:	The Results Framework has serious weaknesses that do not make it possible to compare baselines, targets and results.

Lesson Learned #6:	A sustainable rice value chain would sustain livelihoods and advance gender equality and economic development
Context/comment:	The project is integrating rural women as rice producers and direct beneficiaries, which has led to their high interest and distribution of project benefits to communities and family members.

Outcome, output	Text in Results Framework	Re-phrased text*	Justification	TM Recommendation
GEF Core Indicator 9 Reduction, disposal/ destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in process, materials and products	Baseline: 333 tons active ingredients of hazardous herbicides & pesticides used on 90K ha rice) Mid-term target: 50 metric tons toxic chemicals reduced End target: 100 metric tons toxic chemicals reduced.	Baseline: 333 metric tons of toxic chemicals used on 90K ha rice Mid-term target: 50 metric tons toxic chemicals reduced on 90K ha rice [require change of baseline text] End target: 100 metric tons toxic chemicals reduced on 90K rice [require change of baseline text]	Baseline and targets must use same unit of measurement, which should be metric tons (ton is a US unit). GIZ informs that the project does not measure active ingredients but chemicals. Mid-term target and end target were adjusted to use the same wording as in the updated baseline.	**NOT ACCEPTED** Active ingredients is a proxy for toxic chemicals and break down of these toxic chemicals to analyze "active" components is not possible. Furthermore, an active ingredient is a substance that produces a desired effect/ biological action. However, determining that is beyond the scope of this project, since there may be several "active" ingredients in a pesticide that may have several biological effects (both desirable and toxic).
GEF Core Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	Mid-term target: 20,000 beneficiaries End target: 45,000 beneficiaries (50% female beneficiaries)	Mid-term targets: 20,000 direct beneficiaries At least 50% female direct beneficiaries End targets: 45,000 direct beneficiaries At least 50% female direct beneficiaries	Mid-term targets: It should say 'direct beneficiaries' in line with the GEF Core Indicator text and also: Gender target: (i) Should say *at least* 50% female; (ii) There should be separate targets of number of direct beneficiaries and % female direct beneficiaries because it is	**ACCEPTED** The PIRs and reporting to GEF will stay the same.

			possible to comply with one and not the other. End targets: Same as for mid-term	
Outcome 1. National policy strengthened, inter-ministerial collaboration improved, and environmental outcomes achieved under the framework of New Theory Farming Policy	Outcome indicator: Number of policies and regulatory approaches adopted by the government, to implement a national roadmap for sustainable rice landscapes, enable restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems services. There is no baseline or mid-term target, only an end target.	Same outcome indicator. Baseline: 0 Mid-term target: 0 End-target: At least 2 rice production landscapes with SRP and Landscape Approaches in each province	The Outcome need a baseline and mid-term target. An end target was already established at the moment of approval but should not exist without a baseline.	**NOT ACCEPTED** The indicator clearly states, "approaches adopted" and therefore is an additionality of the project. Hence, there is no need for baseline and mid-term targets necessarily. End target is clearly defined.
Output 1.1 The positive economic and environmental benefits of an integrated SRP and landscape approach have been demonstrated to and are acknowledged by national governmental agencies	Indicator 1.1 a. Number of coordinated Government agencies and stakeholders that adopt integrated SRP & Landscape Approaches. Indicator 1.1 b. Number of capacity development plans designed and implemented Baseline: 0. At present no government agencies have validated and adopted an Integrated SRP & Landscape Approach for increasing their management capacity to support multi-sectoral and multi-agency policy-making processes. Mid-term target 1.1 a. 50% of involved / relevant government agencies Mid-term target 1.1. b. Draft plans designed and tested [no number specified]	(Indicators maintained) Mid-term target 1.1 a. 50% of involved or relevant government agencies have validated and adopted an Integrated SRP & Landscape Approach. Mid-term target 1.1. b. X draft capacity development plans designed and tested [number must be specified] End Target 1.1 a. All involved or relevant government agencies have validated and adopted an Integrated SRP & Landscape Approach. End target 1.1. b. At least 2 capacity development plans implemented for supporting multi-sectoral and multi-agency policy-making processes for a landscape approach	-Indicators and targets must clearly measure the same. -Indicator and mid-term target say 'plans'; but end target says 'programs'. They must measure the same.	**NOT ACCEPTED** Plans and programs are used inter-changeably to refer to trainings. In this case, it is simply an issue of semantics. The indicator is reported quantitatively in any case.

	End target 1.1 a. All involved / relevant government agencies End Target 1.1 b. At least 2 capacity development programs implemented to improve government agencies' management capacity for supporting multi-sectoral and multi-agency policy-making processes for a landscape approach			
Output 1.2 A national roadmap is developed and agreed for integrated target setting, investments, management, and monitoring for sustainable rice landscapes as well as to enable restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at provincial level in Chiang Rai and Ubon Ratchathani	Indicator 1.2 A national roadmap document for SLM has been developed and is endorsed by the relevant authorities Baseline: No road map Mid-term target: A draft proposal ready End target: Final roadmap document	Output 1.2 An agreed national roadmap for integrated target setting, investments, management, and monitoring of sustainable rice landscapes, as well as to enable restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at provincial level in Chiang Rai and Ubon Ratchathani Indicator 1.2 Number of agreed national roadmaps for integrated target setting, investments, management, and monitoring sustainable rice landscapes as well as to enable restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at provincial level in Chiang Rai and Ubon Ratchathani	-See definition of Output below the table. -Indicator mentions a document for SLM but the output is not exactly the same	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original text is in line with an output An agreed national roadmap is an output, and having "number of agreed roadmaps" as indicator increases the scope of the project, and is not in touch with ground realities.
Output 1.3 National multi-agency agreement reached and applied on better alignment of the Mega Farm and Flood Retention Development Programs for meeting the interests of both the rice sector with the financing and protection of lowland and upland hydrological and forest BD services	Indicator 1.3. Number of national multi-agency, multi-stakeholder policy documents Baseline: At present there is no policy document on integrated landscape management, sustainable food production, conservation and restoration of habitats. Furthermore, there is no strategy of financing of related Mid-term target: Draft available for peer review and consultations End target: Policy document available	Output 1.3 National multi-agency agreement on better alignment of the Mega Farm and Flood Retention Development Programs Indicator 1.3: Number of national multi-agency agreements on Mega Farm and Flood Retention Development Programs Baseline: 0 Mid-term target: Draft national multi-agency agreement available for peer review and consultations End target: National multi-agency agreement reached and applied	-See definition of Output below the table. Also, note that additional information in the RFW is not required – it is better to mention in the text. -Baseline should be zero because before the project there was no policy document. -Mid-term target and end target were specified and aligned with the output text (note: agreement – not policy document)	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original text is in line with an output **Accepted –** baseline will be set to 0 in PIR/ HYPR reporting

Output 1.4 Reduced agrochemical pollution through regulatory approaches and collaboration with the private sector (PPP) on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) (e.g. proper disposal of contaminated containers)	Indicator 1.4 Number of agreements with private sector established that pertain to reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in process, materials and products. Baseline; Same as for GEF Core indicator 9 (see above) Targets: Same as for GEF Core indicator 9 (see above)	Output 1.4. Regulatory approaches and collaboration with the private sector (PPP) on Extended Producer Responsibility. Baseline: See re-phrased text for GEF Core indicator 9 (above) Targets: See re-phrased text for GEF Core indicator 9 (above)	-See justification for re-phrased text to baseline and targets for GEF Core indicator 9 (above) -See definition of Output below the table. -Note that 'reduced agrochemical pollution' is an impact that is a result of the approaches and collaboration	**NOT ACCEPTED** The suggested text is much narrower in scope and instruments to achieve reduction in agrochemical pollution
Outcome 2. Management of forested landscapes improved for enhancing environmental integrity and productivity of neighbouring agricultural areas, including rice, by the governments of Chiang Rai and Ubon Ratchathani	Baseline: (i) Land areas: 0 (ii) Farmers' welfare: Baselines to be established in year 1 Mid-term target: No mid-term target End targets: (i) For land area values see output indicators below; (ii) Farmers' welfare: 25% increase over baseline (disaggregated by gender, 50% women)	Baseline: (i) Land areas: 0 (ii) Farmers' welfare: [IRRI to provide baseline, not yet finished] Mid-term and End targets should be determined after the baseline.	Baselines should be ready before project start. There is also no mid-term target. The end target (25% increase of farmers' welfare) is not possible to measure without a baseline.	**NOT ACCEPTED** IRRI is calculating the baseline, not sure how including them in the text changes anything. The baselines will be reported as part of PIR and HYR as and when completed. The reporting to GEF is done quantitively in any case.
Output 2.1 Two spatial landscape management plans produced and agreed at provincial level that integrate sustainable agriculture with improved landscape conservation and restoration of ecosystem services and biodiversity	Baseline to be established in year 1 Mid-term target: 5% increase over baseline End target: 15% increase over baseline	Output 2.1. Two spatial landscape management plans that integrate sustainable agriculture with improved landscape conservation and restoration of ecosystem services and biodiversity. Baseline: To be finalised Mid-term and End targets should be determined after the baseline.	-See definition of Output below the table. -The RFW has no baseline, but still a mid-term target of 5 % and end target of 15% increase over baseline. Baseline must be finished and give information to define targets.	**NOT ACCEPTED** No, production of landscape management plans is an output and the rephrasing is not.
Output 2.2 Government partners (MoAC, RFD, provincial administrations of UR&CR) implement landscape management plans through investments that reduce negative environmental impacts and restore ecosystem/ water services of	Indicator 2.1 Percentage increase in government budget allocated for investments through implementing landscape management plans Indicator 2.2.1 – *GEF Core Indicator 3.2* Area of land restored Indicator 2.2.2 – *GEF Core Indicator 4.1* Area under	Output 2.2 Landscape management plans with the purpose to reduce negative environmental impacts and restore HCVP ecosystem/water services. Indicator 2.1 Number of landscape management plans with the purpose to reduce negative environmental impacts and restore HCVP ecosystem/water services	See definition of Output, Outcome and Impact below. Availability of landscape management plans is an output; Implementation of these plans (including e.g., investments) is an outcome; reduced negative environmental impacts and restoration of ecosystem/ water services of HCVF for agricultural areas are impacts.	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original framing is in line with definition of an output.

HCVF for agricultural areas such as Mega Farms.	improved management for BD, carbon and water services Indicator 2.2.3 – *GEF Core Indicator 4.3* Area of agroforests/ multiple crop systems under improved production (SLM) Indicator 2.2.4 – *GEF Core Indicator 4.4* Area under improved conservation management in HCVF and other key habitats	[indicators 2.2.1 to 2.2.4 should be taken out]		
Output 2.3 Gender-inclusive agriculture diversification and development program designed and agreed (including coffee, fruit-crops, agroforestry) in upland HCVF in Ubon Ratchathani & Chiang Rai		Output 2.3 Gender-inclusive agriculture diversification and development program (including coffee, fruit-crops, agroforestry) in upland HCVF of Ubon Ratchathani & Chiang Rai	See definition of Output below.	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original framing is in line with definition of an output, and the reframing is narrower in scope
Outcome 3. Environmental and social benefits on- and off-farm obtained by deployment of SRP Standard and diversification of agricultural production widely adopted by small farmers in selected provinces	Baseline: -Area under SRP Standard = 0; -Percentage of total amount targeted (USD 20 million) of (combined) financing generated and secured though the financing mechanisms = 0	Outcome 3: SRP Standard and diversification of agricultural production widely adopted by small farmers in selected provinces. Baseline: -Area under SRP Standard = 0 -Funding made available during the project = 0	See definition of Outcome below. The farmers' adoption is an outcome. Environmental and social benefits of this adoption are impacts. Second part of baseline text was simplified	**NOT ACCEPTED** Benefits obtained is an outcome; this is an issue of semantics
Output 3.4 The economic and technical feasibility of new technology and incentive mechanisms for linking the SRP Standard with an integrated landscape approach is analyzed and proven		Output 3.4 The economic and technical feasibility of new technology and incentive mechanisms for linking the SRP Standard with an integrated landscape approach.	See definition of Output below	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original is in line with definition of an output
Output 3.5 Value chain actors promote market-based solutions that drive demand for sustainable rice systems and products		Output 3.5 Market-based solutions for sustainable rice systems and products.	See definition of Output below.	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original is in line with definition of an output, and the rephrased text is narrower in scope
Outcome 4.		Outcome 4. Application of SRP standards and integrated landscape	See definition of Outcome below. Application of SRP standards and	**NOT ACCEPTED**

Environmental, technical and socio-economic benefits from implementation of SRP standards and integrated landscape approaches are understood by government agencies, private companies, and farmers willing to replicate this scheme at national and regional level		approaches by government agencies, private companies, and farmers willing to replicate this scheme at national and regional level.	approaches by Govt agencies etc. is the Outcome. Environmental, technical and socio-economic benefits are impacts of this application.	The original is in line with definition of an outcome
Output 4.1 A national outreach campaign implemented to strengthen governmental and farmer adoption of sustainable rice value chains and integrated landscape management for multiple services	Baseline: KAP (1-5) to be determined in year 1 disaggregated by group Mid-term target: Not included End target: 80% increase over baseline scores (target audiences including 50% women)	Output 4.1 A national outreach campaign to strengthen governmental and farmer adoption of sustainable rice value chains and integrated landscape management for multiple services Baseline: TBD Mid-term target: TBD after existence of baseline End target: TBD after existence of baseline	See definition of Output below. Baseline must be defined. There is also no mid-term target (OK due to lack of baseline), but the end target says 80% increase over baseline scores that needs a baseline to be determined.	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original is in line with definition of an output The baseline is being calculated by IRRI
Output 4.4 A gender sensitive M&E system is implemented to track project performance and the level of adoption of SRP/Integrated Landscape Management approach	Indicator 4.4.1 Farmer-based data collection systems (i.e.: farm books) are established to contribute to the SRP validation & quality assurance system, as well as monitoring of on-farm and off-farm environmental impacts of SRP practices Indicator 4.4.2 – same as indicator 2.4 Indicator 4.4.3 – *GEF Core Indicator 11* Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (50% female)	Output 4.4 A gender sensitive M&E system to track project performance and the level of adoption of SRP/Integrated Landscape Management approach. Indicator 4.4 A gender sensitive M&E system established Baseline: 0 Mid-term target: Gender sensitive M&E system designed End target: Gender sensitive M&E system implemented [Indicators 4.4.1 – 4.4.3 to be taken out]	See definition of Output below. The output should have an indicator that is easy to monitor. Indicator 4.4.1 mentions activities that could be part of the project but do not need to be an indicator for this output. Indicator 4.4.2 says “same as indicator 2.4”, but that indicator does not exist (see above). Indicator 4.4.3 is the same as GEF Core Indicator 11 (see above).	**NOT ACCEPTED** The original is in line with definition of an output

*UNEP’s Glossary of Results Definitions (December 2023) defines the following terms as follows: **Baseline:** An integral part of a results indicator. It is the situation prior to an intervention, specific to the performance indicators against which progress on results can be assessed or comparisons made. **Target:** What the project wants to achieve within a certain period, in relation to one of the expected results. Since the indicator should be neutral, the indicator target is what signals the magnitude of the desired change and in what direction. The baseline and target should use the same unit of measurement as the indicator. **Activity**: An action taken, or work performed, through which inputs are utilized to realize specific results. **Output**: The availability (for intended beneficiaries/users) of new products and services and/or gains in knowledge, abilities and awareness of individuals or within institutions. **Outcome**: A change at institutional level, or changes in behaviours, attitudes or conditions achieved from the use (i.e., uptake, adoption, application) of outputs by intended beneficiaries. **Impact**: Long-lasting result arising, directly or indirectly from a project. Impacts are intended and positive changes and must relate to UNEP’s mandate.