

Building Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Framework for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in Thailand

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11850

Countries

Thailand

Project Name

Building Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Framework for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in Thailand

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

1/22/2025

Review completed by PM

2/13/2025

Program Manager

Naoko Nakagawa

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

a) Yes, the GEF supports national and regional implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, as well as targeted capacity building to facilitate ratification of the Protocol.

b) Yes.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

a) Yes.

b) Yes, roughly.

c) Yes, roughly at 10%.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 3, 2025

Addressed. More updated information on other ongoing ABS initiatives, e.g., that by GIZ etc. are identified.

NN Feb 11, 2025

c) The government programs relevant to ABS are described, while other externally funded projects are not mentioned. Please include a clear paragraph if there have been other externally funded projects (GEF and non-GEF) and clarify how the GEF alternative will build on them.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Responses 27 Feb. 2025

There are almost no other initiatives on Nagoya Protocol in Thailand. However, we found one recent GIZ initiative and added it to the Baseline Activities section, p. 8, as the following:

Additionally, a collaborative initiative led by GIZ and ONEP organized a series of nationwide workshops in 2024 aimed at preparing Thai stakeholders for Nagoya Protocol ratification and implementation. These workshops were held across five regions: Chanthaburi, Nakhon Si Thammarat, Chiang Mai, and Kanchanaburi, and concluded with a public forum in Bangkok on 24 September 2024, focusing on legal gap analyses, capacity building, and stakeholder engagement in ABS processes.

Also, we added this initiative to the section Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects, p. 25-26.

Additionally, under Component 1 in the Project Theory of Change section we mentioned that the project will collaborate with GIZ Thailand, p. 13:

Under the Component, the project will collaborate with GIZ Thailand to promote ABS policy, operational procedures, benefit sharing at the local community level, and action plans for ratification and implementation of Nagoya Protocol in Thailand.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 3, 2025

a) Addressed.

b) Addressed/corrected.

NN Feb 11, 2025

a) Yes. However, please correct the bubble that says Component 5: M&E, which is understood to be Component 4. Please also explain why the private sector is assumed to be interested in participating in the ABS activities.

b) Yes. However, please revise the headings of Component 2 and 3 titles in the narrative immediately following the ToC diagram, as they seem to include unintended phrases.

Component 2. *Supporting community-based ABS models in four target provinces is expected to remove the Barrier 2: scale of ABS implementation by local communities*

Outcome 2. *Increased involvement of local communities in ABS projects in Thailand*

Component 3. *ABS knowledge management, awareness, and gender mainstreaming is suggested to remove the Barrier 3: Low awareness of key stakeholders about ABS and lack of ABS knowledge management and best practice dissemination mechanism in the country*

Outcome 3. *Project ABS best practices and gender-inclusive models are replicated and scaled up in the target provinces and beyond*

Agency's Comments

UNDP responses 27 Feb.2025

The ToC diagram has been edited as requested, p. 17. There is a separate section in the PIF Private Sector involvement that describes why private sector is interested to participate in ABS activities, p.24-25. However, we added the following in the description of the ToC, p.15:

Private sector companies in Thailand are assumed to support ABS activities because these initiatives secure access to valuable genetic resources within clear and fair legal frameworks, driving innovation, mitigating business risks, and enhancing market competitiveness.

The wording of the Components 2 and 3 has been corrected, p. 18-19.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 3, 2025

Addressed.

(NN Feb 11, 2025)

Please include incremental cost reasoning. The co-financing shows that BEDO along has USD 10 million worth of government budget for implementation of Nagoya Protocol. Please articulate how the proposed GEF MSP investment of less than USD 2 million will produce incremental benefit that is otherwise not possible without the GEF investment.

Agency's Comments

27 Feb.2025

The Incremental Cost Reasoning section has been added to the PIF, p. 15.:

Incremental Cost Reasoning

With GEF incremental support, the project will catalyze transformative change by developing Thailand's national ABS policy framework, enhancing capacity at all levels, and expanding community-based ABS initiatives in key biodiversity areas of Thailand. The project will (a) establish clear and enforceable ABS policies, operational procedures, and legal frameworks in line with the Nagoya Protocol; (b) build the capacity of government institutions, private sector stakeholders, and local communities to negotiate and implement ABS agreements; (c) support the development of Community-Based Biological Resources Management Units in four provinces to ensure local participation in ABS governance; and (d) scale up ABS knowledge management and awareness campaigns to enable replication of best practices at a national level. Through these interventions, the project will help conserve biodiversity, ensure equitable benefit-sharing, and contribute to sustainable economic growth in Thailand.

The Thai government and national agencies, including BEDO, ONEP, and the Royal Forest Department, have committed \$14 million in co-financing to support biodiversity conservation efforts in the project framework. These funds alone are insufficient to meet the full incremental costs required to achieve the global environmental benefits, as they provide parallel funding that supports baseline biodiversity management and routine regulatory functions, but not a transformative and innovative shift in ABS operationalization and implementation, policy coherence, and equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms. Without GEF support, these efforts will remain localized and insufficient to drive systemic ABS adoption nationwide. The GEF contribution of \$1.685 million will fill critical funding gaps by financing ABS policy development, capacity-building programs, and pilot ABS initiatives in four target provinces. These investments will create a robust enabling environment, allowing Thailand to fully operationalize its ABS framework, engage communities in sustainable genetic resource management, and ensure long-term conservation benefits. The GEF increment will allow achieve a number of Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) in Thailand that are described below.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 17, 2025

PM Cleared.

NN Mar 3, 2025

b) The Yes tickbox is unchecked. However, please remove the paragraph "The potential execution support will be assessed during the PPG phase, following a detailed evaluation and the completion of the HACT micro-assessment of MNRE as the Implementation Partner. During this phase, MNRE and UNDP will explore all available options, including the possibility of third-party support, to determine if execution support is required". Needs for execution support should not be preempted.

c) Addressed. Table 2 now includes more updated information.

NN Feb 11, 2025

a) Yes.

b) GEF policies, further explained in the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle, require that the separation of implementation functions performed by GEF Agencies and execution functions performed by Project Executing Entities is a key feature of the governance of the GEF Partnership and an important aspect of the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards.?

See

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf. (pages 44-45)

At PIF stage, Agency (dual?) execution should not be included in the Agency's proposal. Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in project preparation and if it anticipates a need for Agency execution, the Agency would submit full information and justification for a request for policy exception. Therefore, at PIF stage, GEF agency execution should not be preempted. Accordingly, please indicate No, for agency execution.

Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project? Yes

If so, please describe that role here. Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing

The potential execution support and rational to seek an exception to the policy will be assessed during the PPG phase, following a detailed evaluation and completion of the HACT micro-assessment of MNR as the Implementing Partner. During this phase, the project will explore all available options, including possibility of third-party support, to determine if execution support can be requested on an exceptional basis.

Please also correct the description of UNDP in the Key Stakeholder table. UNDP should be GEF Implementing Agency, rather than Executing Agency and the role should be to provide oversight, rather than providing direct technical support to the project management.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other UNDP/GEF projects	Assistance to sustainable development and biodiversity conservation programs in Thailand, including implementation of Nagoya Protocol principles regarding fair and equitable access to and utilization of genetic resources	are measure and transparent. GEF Executive Agency. Technical support to the project management, coordination with other UNDP and GEF initiatives in Thailand, project Quality Assurance.
---	--	--

c) Table 2 shows other relevant projects and short description. Please include explanation how such projects are relevant to this proposed project, how the coordination is anticipated, and also include the timing/duration.

d) Yes.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Responses 17 Mar 2025

The paragraph has been removed as requested p. 28.

UNDP response 27 Feb25

We have removed the Yes Box under Execution Support. This will be further assessed during the PPG phase. We also added the following explanation, p. 25: The potential execution support will be assessed during the PPG phase, following a detailed evaluation and the completion of the HACT micro-assessment of MNRE as the Implementation Partner. During this phase, MNRE and UNDP will explore all available options, including the possibility of third-party support, to determine if execution support is required

UNDP's role has been corrected as requested, p. 22:

GEF Implementing Agency. Oversight of the project management, coordination with other UNDP and GEF initiatives in Thailand, project Quality Assurance.

We added a timeline for each project/programme in Table 2. Also, we added Relevance to the ABS Project/Coordination column to the Table with description of relevance to and collaboration with the ABS project in Thailand, p. 25-26. Further, a newly approved regional project on ABS, funded by the Republic of Korea, has been added.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

RR/NN Mar 17, 2025

Addressed. CI 6.1 is updated with reasonable assumptions.

NN Mar 3, 2025

b) The agency is invited to include the GHG emission reduction as co-benefits, with the suggested minor revision indicated in the first round of review comment. Please ensure to refer to the latest review sheet comments that was sent back to the agency (C.f., the previous reference to removing GHS emission reduction was in a draft and was actually not officially sent out to the agency).

NN Feb 11, 2025 /RR Feb 13, 2025

a) Yes.

b) The Core Indicator targets 4.1 and 11 are modest but agreeable for the scale of the proposed ABS MSP project.

On CI 6, thank you for the justification provided for the GHG estimates. We note the values computed in the Land Use Change/Deforestation module which are consistent with provided justification and project area. If possible, in order for the calculation to be in line with the proposed project activities, please also consider using on the Cropland module (given that the estimate was that these would be converted into cropland in a scenario with deforestation), and

fill in the types of crops that would be produced in the deforested areas (section 3.1.1): the hectares are already automatically computed, there is just a need to fill in the types of crops and management option. This should normally not affect the result too much, but for the consistency with the project activities. Please revise the number accordingly on this basis.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Responses 17 Mar 2025

CI 6 was brought back in the PIF. Changes were made in the Project summary, p. 3; description of GEBs, p. 17; ToC Diagram, p.19; Core Indicators, pp. 29-30; contribution to NDC, p.34. and core Indicator spreadsheet annex.

The FAO ExAct Tool calculations have been updated as recommended, including explanation for CI 6.5 indicator, pp. 29-30:

CI 6. Greenhouse Gas Emission Mitigated: the following data and assumptions were used for the initial estimates of the potential carbon gains by the ABS project: the area of the ABS initiatives (62,662 ha) represents 100% forested area; deforestation rate in the Chiangmai province was at 6.8% in terms of its total tree cover between 2002 and 2023; in Chiangrai and Nan ? 3.0% for the same period; and in Phrae ? 4.1% for the same period . The average deforestation rate for four target provinces was at 4.23% between 2002 and 2023, or 0.2% annually. It is assumed that without project the same deforestation rate would continue for the next 20 years, that will lead to the loss of 4% of the forest in the project area, or 2,507 ha. It is assumed based on experience of ABS projects in Chiapas, Mexico ; Kakamega Forest, Kenya ; and Western Ghats, India , that the deforestation rate in the project area is likely to decrease by 15% after four-years of ABS project implementation. Thus, in case of the ABS project in Thailand the deforestation rate may decrease by 0.17% annually. That will lead to loss of only 3.4% of forest, or 2,129 ha over the next 20 years if the rate stays stable. In the provinces of Chiang Mai, Chiang Rai, Nan, and Phrae in Thailand, maize (corn) cultivation is the predominant agricultural activity following deforestation. Farmers often practice intensive tillage, involving plowing or turning the soil extensively before planting maize. The regular practice is minimal or negligible organic input. Commonly, farmers practice open burning of maize residues after harvest. The research conducted in northeastern Thailand's mountainous regions indicated that average maize yields were about 5.0 t/ha . These inputs were applied to the FAO Ex-Act Tool (v 9.3.3), which resulted in total avoided emissions of 91,489 metric tons of CO₂e (four years of the project implementation and 16 years of capitalization). See Annex H. FAO Ex-Act Tool.

CI 6.1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO₂e) has been removed from the PIF and GEF Core Indicator section, p. 27.

In response to the first GEF comment (see above), the CI 6.1, contribution to Thailand NDC, and ANNEX H: Carbon gain estimates for the project have been removed and the GEF-8 core indicator spreadsheet updated accordingly.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 3, 2025

Addressed.

NN Feb 11, 2025 /OP Feb 25, 2025

a) Under the key risk table, please include explanation of risk and mitigation measures for the Climate and Environmental and Social, instead of referring to Annex D.

CONTEXT

Climate	Moderate	Please see pre-SESP (Annex D)
Environmental and Social	Substantial	Please see pre-SESP (Annex D)

b) Yes.

c) UNDP SESP is attached.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 27 Feb.2025

We updated the risk table as the following:

Climate: The risk associated with the climate category for the ABS project in Thailand involves the potential for adverse consequences of climate-related hazards. These hazards include increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events such as floods, droughts, and storms, which could significantly impact project activities, biodiversity, and local communities. The interaction of these hazards with vulnerable ecosystems and communities could lead to disruptions in the project's execution, reduced effectiveness of biodiversity conservation efforts, and threats to the livelihoods and well-being of local populations.

Mitigation Strategies: Conduct a climate vulnerability assessment to identify communities and ecosystems at risk and prioritize areas for resilience improvements. Collaborate with meteorological agencies to integrate advanced weather forecasting technologies and ensure communities have access to real-time weather updates. Integrate climate risk assessments into project planning and execution of the project Outputs. Support the diversification of livelihoods to reduce dependency on climate-sensitive resources for ABS.

Environmental and Social: The environment and social risks for the ABS project in Thailand involve potential negative impacts due to environmental changes and social dynamics. These risks include biodiversity loss, soil degradation, water scarcity, demographic changes, and social exclusion. For example, continued habitat destruction and fragmentation could lead to further declines in biodiversity, undermining conservation goals and reducing the availability of genetic resources. Marginalized groups, including indigenous communities and women, may not fully benefit from ABS initiatives due to lack of representation and participation in decision-making processes. Mitigation Strategies: Empower local communities to manage natural resources sustainably through ABS projects. Ensure that marginalized groups, including women and indigenous peoples, are actively involved in ABS projects. This includes promoting their representation in decision-making processes and ensuring equitable benefit-sharing. Specific measures as Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) of policies, plans, and protocols produced by the project; development of the Environmental and

Social Management Framework (ESMF); establishing a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Yes.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 17, 2025

PM Cleared.

NN/IM Mar 3, 2025

The consultation with IPLCs, especially IPs, still remain vague and partial. We are concerned that just adding "LCs and IPs provided insights..." on August 16, 2024 consultation does not provide concrete evidence of their local/tribal origin nor the nature of their participation. It is not convincing that the indicated consultation with "representative from the Herbal Village and Tourism, Muang Kued Village, Chiang Mai Provide" covers any Indigenous Peoples groups in the pilot provinces in northern Thailand.

At PIF stage:

1) Please include ?Indigenous Peoples groups? as a part of key stakeholders under the NGOs and they can be a part of PSC.

2) Please make sure that project design can be flexibly adjusted depending on consultations with Indigenous Peoples groups, and provide evidence of how project design adjusted based on consultation during PPG stage by CEO Approval.

Please note of the GEF Environmental and Social Safeguard Standards (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/environmental-and-social-safeguard-standards>), in particular:

"Indigenous Peoples [Footnote 1] means people belonging to a distinct social and cultural group characterized in varying degrees by (i) self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous social and cultural group and recognition of this identity by others; (ii) collective attachment to geographically distinct Habitats, ancestral territories, or areas of seasonal use or occupation, as well as to the natural resources in these areas; (iii) customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are distinct or separate from those of the mainstream society or culture; and (iv) a distinct language or dialect, often different from the official language or languages of the country or region in which they reside. ?To varying degrees? reflects the fact that some characteristics may be less, or no longer, evident, but have been present and are relevant in identifying Indigenous Peoples.

Footnote 1: This clarification is intended solely for the purpose of this Policy, given that there is no universally accepted definition of Indigenous peoples, and given that these terms and concepts are subject to national legislation and to the different national circumstances of each country, taking into account that many countries have specific interpretations for terms and concepts that already apply within their jurisdictions. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions." (pages 6-7).

The agency is expected to fully engage IPLCs during the PPG process, with evidence/documentation to be provided at the time of CEO approval request.

NN Feb 11, 2025 / IM Feb 25, 2025

Only government consultation is indicated.

However, the PIF checks YES to other stakeholder consultations taken place. Please include descriptions/dates of consultation with IPLCs, CSOs and Private Sector.

Were the following stakeholders consulted during project identification phase:

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities: Yes

Civil Society Organizations: Yes

Private Sector: Yes

We note that UNDP attached the Social and Environmental Screening Template and classified the project's overall ESS risk as substantial risk. For ABS framework, it is critical to have strong engagement with local Indigenous Peoples groups particularly in the Northern Thailand. However, we failed to find evidence of consultation with local Indigenous Peoples organizations at PIF stage.

Please ensure that local Indigenous Peoples Groups are engaged in the project design stage (PIF and PPG) and provide evidence of it including name of the local Indigenous Peoples groups and how the results of consultation are integrated into the project design.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Responses 17 Mar 2025

e have expanded on the engagement with Indigenous People organizations in the Stakeholder table, p. 24, as follows:

Indigenous People Organizations in the target Provinces, e.g., Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), the Network of Indigenous Peoples in Thailand (NIPT), the Inter-Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand Association (IMPECT), etc.

Activities: Promoting and defending the rights of indigenous peoples in Thailand; education and cultural preservation of indigenous communities in Thailand's mountainous regions

Role in the project: IPLCs

-Will actively participate in developing, discussing and implementing of project activities, policies, plans, and ABS initiatives;

-Will share traditional knowledge and provide information for the Social and Environmental screening of the project;

-Will be represented as Members of the PSC;

-Will participate in the project M&E by actively providing feedback, sharing traditional knowledge, and engaging in community-led monitoring and evaluation activities

Also, the following has been added to the Key Stakeholders section, p.25:

The project design can be flexibly adjusted depending on consultations with Indigenous Peoples groups at PPG stage, and ONEP and UNDP will provide evidence of how project design has been adjusted based on consultation with Indigenous People groups for the GEF CEO Approval.

Additionally, more information has been added on the involvement of IPLCs in the development of the PIF, p. 55:

Communities provided insights into biodiversity-based economic activities, emphasizing the role of community enterprise in conserving local biological resources. Their efforts focus on collecting plant species, conducting biodiversity surveys, and developing potential products derived from biodiversity.

However, the IP representative expressed concerns regarding their limited understanding of access and benefit-sharing mechanisms. This highlights the necessity of implementing this project to strengthen local capacity, enhance awareness, and ensure fair and sustainable benefit-sharing from biodiversity and genetic resources.

UNDP responses 27 Feb.25

During the development of the PIF, BEDO engaged in consultations with key stakeholders, including Government, Local Communities, Private sector, Research institution

The PIF consultation table has been updated to include the following consultations, p. 32:

? Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP), BEDO, Royal Forest Department (RFD)

? Local Communities:

Representative from The Herbal Village and Tourism, Muang Kued Village, Chiang Mai Province. Provided insights into sustainable tourism and biodiversity-based economic activities. Discussions focused on how ABS frameworks could support community-driven conservation and livelihood improvement.

? Private sector: Community enterprise

The Community Enterprise for Chinese Malay Apple Processing, Ban Kok, Nan Province. The consultation included discussions on the sustainable use of plant species, traditional processing techniques, and how ABS mechanisms can support equitable benefit-sharing among community members.

? Research Institutions:

Agricultural Research Development Agency (ARDA) to support research and development activities related to the implementation of ABS mechanisms in Thailand.

On Indigenous people, Indigenous people (not recognized legally in Thailand but rather categorized as local communities) are mentioned in the Key Stakeholders section of the PIF, pp. 23-24. Additionally, local and indigenous communities took part in the discussion of the PIF on August 16 2024, see Table Key stakeholders involved in PIF development, p. 35:

Local and Indigenous Communities: Representative from The Herbal Village and Tourism, Muang Kued Village, Chiang Mai Province.

Overall representative of local and indigenous community approved the PIF activities, no specific changes have been suggested. During PPG stage, detailed consultations will be organized with all indigenous communities and organizations in the target provinces.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 3, 2025

Addressed/corrected.

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

However, please correct Indicative Focal Area Elements which indicates BD2-1. For Nagoya Protocol, please use BD2-2.

Indicative Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-financing(\$)
BD-2-1	GET	1,685,160.00	14000000
Total Project Cost		1,685,160.00	14,000,000.00

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 27 Feb.25

This has been corrected as requested. p. 33 in PIF

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes, USD 50,000 requested for MSP.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 3, 2025

Addressed.

NN Feb 11, 2025

The proposed government co-financing appears to be mostly in-kind contribution (e.g., staff salaries and operational expenses). Please review and revise as appropriate. Please also consider including GEF Agency (UNDP)'s co-financing.

Agency's Comments

UNDP responses 27Feb.25

The detail of co-financing will be further solidified during the PPG phase, including specific breakdown of financing between ?recurring expenses? and ?investment mobilized.?

However, we have provided the following estimates based on currently available information.

Government Co-Financing:

? BEDO (Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office)

BEDO has planned to allocate funding for implementing the Nagoya Protocol principles related to fair and equitable access to and utilization of genetic resources and ABS projects scheduled for 2026?2030. This includes in-kind co financing (recurrent expenditure) in the form of staff salaries, office space etc. (USD 5,000,000) and operational activities (public investment/investment mobilised) for supporting the implementation of ABS policies and facilitating local community participation in ABS agreements (USD 5,000,000).

? ONEP (Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning)

ONEP has planned to allocate funding to support the integration of ABS mechanisms into Thailand?s environmental policy framework (2026?2030). This includes in-kind co-financing (recurrent expenditure) for ONEP staff salaries (USD 500,000) and operational activities (public investment/investment mobilised) for supporting the implementation of the ABS mechanism, including the provision of technical expertise, institutional support, and access to relevant policy platforms necessary for mainstreaming ABS mechanism (USD 500,000).

? RFD (Royal Forest Department)

RFD has planned to allocate funding to support forest conservation and biodiversity management activities (Community Forest) in Chiang Rai, Chiang Mai, Nan, and Phrae, which are the project?s areas. This includes in-kind co-financing (recurrent expenditure) in the form of staff salaries (USD 500,000) and operational activities (public investment/investment mobilised) to support the implementation of ABS in the participating areas (USD 500,000).

? ARDA (Agricultural Research Development Agency)

This research institute has planned to allocate funding to support research and development (R&D) activities directly related to implementing ABS mechanisms in Thailand. This includes in-kind co-financing (recurrent expenditure) for staff salaries, office space etc. (USD 500,000) and operational activities for supporting the scientific research, innovation initiatives, and capacity-building programs to enhance the sustainable use of genetic resources, knowledge-sharing platforms, and facilitation of partnerships among local communities, research institutions, and the private sector, and the development of bio-based economic activities related to ABS initiatives (USD 1,500,000).

? GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft f?r Internationale Zusammenarbeit)

GIZ has planned to allocate funding to support policy development, capacity building, and technical assistance related to the implementation of ABS mechanisms in Thailand from 2026 to 2030. GIZ?s contribution will focus on strengthening national ABS policies and operational frameworks, facilitating stakeholder consultations, and enhancing the capacity of government officials and local communities in the Chiang Rai, Chiang Mai, Nan, and Phrae Provinces. This includes in-kind co-financing for staff salaries, office space etc. (USD 30,000) as well as operational activities for supporting advisory services, stakeholder engagement facilitation, and policy dialogue support to strengthen Thailand?s ABS framework (USD 20,000).

? UNDP

UNDP has planned to allocate funding to support project management, capacity building, and knowledge-sharing activities related to implementing ABS mechanisms in Thailand from 2026 to 2030. UNDP Thailand's contribution will facilitate stakeholder engagement, develop community-based ABS models, and promote gender-inclusive and equitable benefit-sharing practices in the Chiang Rai, Chiang Mai, Nan, and Phrae Provinces. This includes in-kind co-financing (recurrent expenditure) on staff salaries, office space etc. (USD 250,000) and financial support for project coordination, the organization of awareness campaigns, and knowledge-sharing activities including the dissemination of best practices to enhance local and national capacities for sustainable use of genetic resources (USD 50,000).

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's CommentsYes.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 3, 2025

Addressed.

NN Feb 11, 2025

Biodiversity as Principal Objective 2 is agreeable.

Climate Change Adaptation is proposed to be Principal Objective 2, however, No Contribution 0 or Significant Objective 1 may be more adequate. Please briefly justify your updates.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 27 Feb.2025

This has been corrected as requested in ANNEX E: RIO MARKERS, p. 37, PIF

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 11, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 17, 2025

Yes, the project is recommended for technical clearance.

NN Mar 3, 3035

Not at this time. Please address the comments 5.3, 5.4 and 7.2 and resubmit.

NN Feb 11, 2025 / OP Feb 25, 2025

Not at this time. Please address the comments provided and resubmit.

Agency's Comments

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/
Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

(NN Mar 3, 3035)

Please ensure that local Indigenous Peoples Groups are engaged during the PPG process and provide evidence of it including name of the local Indigenous Peoples groups and how the results of consultation are integrated into the project design.

(VL Feb 25, 2025)

Please provide some indicative budget for the Gender Action Plan and related gender-specific activities/outputs in Components 1 and 2.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 27 Feb.25

The following has been added to the Gender Equality and Mainstreaming section of the PIF, p. 27:

The total estimated budget the project will allocate to implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming plan is USD 197,316, including the salary of Gender and Safeguard Officer (half-time employment) - USD 28,800, and gender mainstreaming activities budget (~10% of project budget) - USD 168,516.

Additionally, gender specific activities have been added to all project Outputs, pp. 20-23. For example, for the Output 1.1:

Gender will be mainstreamed in the output by ensuring the development of national ABS policy and operational procedures incorporates gender-responsive approaches, including consultations with both women and men, addressing gender-differentiated needs, and promoting women's active participation in policy-making and capacity-building activities.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	2/11/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/17/2025	3/17/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		