

Mainstreaming biodiversity-based tourism in Thailand to support sustainable tourism development

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10409

Countries

Thailand

Project Name

Mainstreaming biodiversity-based tourism in Thailand to support sustainable tourism development

Agenices

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/12/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Many thanks for the thorough clarifications and improvements in the PIF. Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

The project has the strong potential to be aligned with BD-1-1 as a project mainstreaming biodiversity in the tourism sector and to deliver important global biodiversity benefits.

It is not entirely clear, however, to what extent the project will carry out mainstreaming versus developing niche biodiversity-friendly tourism development. The project does notably not explicitly articulate how it will address unsustainable tourism, which is the first threat identified in the PIF (p6), and how it would do so with less than a 3 million grant from the GEF. The main idea seems to be to promote “green” tourism development in secondary tourism sites (through demonstration under this GEF project and subsequent replication) to (i) avoid impact on biodiversity in these secondary locations and (ii) disperse visitors from overcrowded places, as well as doing some real mainstreaming in national framework documents, monitoring tools and standards.

Please clarify if it so and make your theory of change explicit in the description of the alternative scenario, articulating the project's strategy to contribute to biodiversity mainstreaming in the tourism sector at large with realistic ambition given the project size.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

The project theory of change has been added to the description of the project's alternative scenario. In brief this will work in parallel to (i) integrate biodiversity conservation within key elements of national tourism policy and planning, including at overall strategy level (national biodiversity-based tourism strategy, supporting MONRE inputs to national tourism committee), operational level (operational policies on biodiversity financing solutions for tourism, ecological capacity assessment and tourism impact monitoring, integration of biodiversity within existing tourism standards and government tourism initiatives), and broader capacity development and awareness-raising of government; and (ii) at provincial level, integrate biodiversity conservation within tourism planning (multi-sector committee, completion of SEA that can be integrated into provincial development plan, ecological capacity assessment at key sites), development (roll-out of new standards for tourism development, development of visitor/tourism management plans) and operations (engagement of private sector in tourism standards and monitoring). Part of this provincial model will include the development of biodiversity-based tourism products and experiences that generate revenue for local communities and build their support and engagement in biodiversity conservation, but this is only a part of an integrated component which will equally focus on ensuring that the protection of biodiversity assets that underpin tourism is built into provincial processes for tourism planning approvals and development. This has been clarified in the PIF through revisions to Table B including reformulation of Component 2.

The term ‘biodiversity-based tourism’ is applied broadly in the PIF to cover tourism that uses or depends upon healthy biodiversity, from visitation of natural sites to specific tourism products/experiences that ‘use’ biodiversity (e.g. wildlife watching, diving, sustainable harvesting of natural reeds for handicraft products). This is a familiar term in Thailand and reflected in the name of the government implementing partner BEDO – the Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office – established to build broader awareness and understanding of the underpinning role that biodiversity plays in supporting Thailand’s economic development. The use of the term biodiversity-based tourism is not really about the development of a niche biodiversity product *per se*, but about taking a positive slant on the integration of biodiversity conservation within tourism to show the positive impacts that this can have on overall tourism sustainability (e.g. protection of natural assets important for tourism), biodiversity (e.g. increased revenue generation), and communities (e.g. improved livelihoods). The project’s approaches have been identified to align with the current directions of Thailand tourism policy and maximize the potential for engagement and integration of biodiversity conservation within the government’s overall tourism policy and planning framework. As policy directions are based heavily on community-based tourism development, this project will need to show tangible benefits for local communities in the approach it uses to mainstream biodiversity conservation into tourism. The identified demonstration landscape of Prachuap Khiri Khan is a secondary tourism destination in Thailand which will add further benefit through helping to avoid overcrowding at key tourism destinations as tourism is disbursed across more destinations. Prachuap Khiri Khan in itself is also at risk of tourism impacts if tourism development is not managed wisely and this is also an intended outcome of the project.

With a \$3m GEF investment, the project has been designed to integrate biodiversity conservation within existing tourism-related initiatives and efforts underway in Thailand rather than establish stand-alone products. This adds to the complexity of the project as it will require the engagement of multiple partners across government for its success and sustainability. BEDO has engaged closely with relevant parts of government during PIF development – namely Ministry of Tourism and Sports, Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation, Department of Marine and Coastal Resources – to ensure their support for the project. All have expressed early support for the project and indicated they will provide co-financing commitments. The needs of different agencies have also been integrated into the PIF design (e.g. DNP’s interest in more practical, standardized tools for assessment of capacity of natural sites for tourism which it can then deploy across Thailand’s PAs).

Revisions have been made to the project components, outcomes and outputs to better reflect this theory of change and clarify the different approaches of the project and its mainstreaming focus.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Thank you for the clarifications and improvements. Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

On output 1.3, please clarify to what extent the methodologies developed will also be applicable to assess the ecological and social limits, impacts and benefits of tourism that is not designed to be biodiversity-friendly (see comment on the use of the term "biodiversity-based" in II.3) and for tourism at large.

Please clarify why output 1.5 does not also include capacity building for biodiversity mainstreaming in the tourism sector at large.

On outcome 2, please :

- consider reformulating outcomes and outputs to make clearer which are about mainstreaming or niche biodiversity-friendly tourism development
- revise indicator on the % of local households benefiting from BD-based tourism with diversified outcome. This indicator seems to mix : (i) outcome diversification; (ii) monitoring of the number of beneficiaries, (iii) increase in revenues.
- clarify the generic term "scheme" in output 2.2 and for which stakeholders/institutions "revenue generation options" (iv) will be demonstrated (revenues for protected areas?).
- clarify what "demonstrating" a standard or impact monitoring means (Output 2.3) in the context of the project and how it links with training and capacity development. Consider reformulating and/or splitting the output in several outputs related to : standards; monitoring; training.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

Output 1.3 applies to tourism in general and will develop practical methodologies to evaluate and monitor adverse impacts of over-tourism on ecological assets. There is increasing recognition within Thailand that tourism controls and restrictions (including site closures) need to be put in place at heavily-visited sites where tourism has damaged and/or degraded ecological assets. To align to Thai policy directions and reflect socio-ecological systems the methodologies will also cover impacts of

tourism on local communities, both adverse and positive. This will provide an overall monitoring system for assessing both ecological and social benefits and impacts of tourism. This need for such monitoring tools comes from DNP, who has in principle committed to upscale adopted methodologies in national parks across Thailand. The methodologies are proposed for demonstration under Component 2 in Prachuap Khiri Khan landscape. These may also be demonstrated at a high-biodiversity site(s) at risk from over-tourism depending on DNP priorities which will be assessed during the PPG phase. The wording and description of the output has been revised to better reflect its scope and intent to cover all tourism impact.

Output 1.5 is intended to cover capacity building for mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism planning, development, operations and monitoring/compliance. This has now been corrected in the output wording and description.

For Outcome 2, the following revisions have been made:

- The component title, outcomes and outputs have been reformulated to better outline the project approach of developing an integrated model for mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism planning and operations at a provincial level, that will include (i) attention to mainstream biodiversity into provincial tourism planning, development and operations; and (ii) effort on developing new biodiversity-compatible tourism products and experiences that build community support for biodiversity conservation and provide tangible livelihood benefits. Outputs have been reformulated accordingly (see below).

- The indicator on livelihoods improvement has been revised to “% of local households deriving income from biodiversity-based/compatible tourism”. The indicator is intended to measure the increased flow of economic benefits from tourism across local communities. It is well-aligned to Thai government policy to use community-based tourism development to help reduce income inequality and address unequal distribution of benefits from tourism at community level.

- Output 2.2 has been reformulated as multiple outputs to build clarity of how the GEF funds will be used and better delineate the mainstreaming emphasis from targeted tourism product development. This is now split into three outputs that focus on: the development of visitor management plans (including zoning), business plans and sustainable financing/revenue generation mechanisms for the project sites/PAs (Output 2.2); the promotion and roll-out of tourism sector standards and impact monitoring across the local tourism sector (Output 2.3); and the development of community-based tourism products and experiences that respect biodiversity and generate engagement and livelihood benefits for local communities (Output 2.4). For Output 2.3, revenue generation options will be piloted at two PAs and one

non-PA area. The revenue generation options will seek to increase revenue available for biodiversity conservation (e.g. through increasing PA revenue or through the establishment of fees/charges that flow into community trust funds and are disbursed for biodiversity conservation). Exact mechanisms for each site will be determined during the PPG in consultation with government and local stakeholders and BIOFIN technical specialists. This has been clarified in the PIF.

- The demonstration of standards has been reformulated into its own output (Output 2.3) for clarity. Extra detail has been added to clarify the proposed mechanisms to engage private sector in the deployment of standards, such as through broadening of the existing 'Green Hotel Scheme' of the Department of Environmental Quality Protection to explicitly cover biodiversity conservation.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Thank you for the clarifications. Cleared.

Please consolidate co-funding, in particular from the private sector and the tourism fund created by the May 2019 National Tourism Policy Act, during PPG.

JS 10/23/2019

\$20 million co-financing is identified with more than \$7 million investment mobilized but are attribute to broad categories of stakeholders. To what extent these figure reflect discussions with the co-funders at this stage and which part can already be attributed to a specific co-funder?

Please clarify to what extent the \$5.6 million investment mobilized from the Government corresponds to the new tourism fund created by the may 2019 National Tourism Policy Act. What is the anticipated calendar for the set up of this fund?

\$400,000 investment mobilized from the private sector seems relatively small for a project dealing with the tourism sector in Thailand. Please justify the amount.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

The project has been discussed with the listed co-financers and all have expressed in principle support to be co-financers. For government, the co-financing figures are based on initial discussions with key agencies and the review of indicative forward budget estimates and expected new work programs / potential for investment mobilized. Due to complicated government approval processes for co-financing and the need for internal formal co-financing letters it is not possible to accurately demarcate these to individual agencies at this stage and these will only be confirmed during the PPG phase. Nevertheless, there is good indicative support from a range of parties. The key government co-financing partners will be BEDO, MOTS, DNP and DMCR, with more targeted contributions from the other listed government agencies. The estimates for local government co-financing have been revised down slightly as further investigation reveals lower financial alignment that initially estimated, although this is offset by increased private sector co-financing estimates (see below).

There is no clear calendar for the establishment of the tourism fund and its formulation and scope remain under discussion by government. The investment mobilized estimate assumes a contribution from the tourism fund through the disbursement of grants to communities for biodiversity conservation that protects/maintains natural tourism assets. It is difficult to estimate accurately at this stage as the design of the fund is not settled, but an indicative estimate is up to \$1-1.5 million across Prachuap Khiri Khan and broader replication over the timeframe of the project (NB: through further review this estimate has been revised marginally downward from the initial PIF submission). The project design will reflect the activities that are needed to mainstream local biodiversity conservation into this planned fund and into other new policy measures taking place under the Thai Tourism Policy Act to maximize the potential for investment mobilized.

The private sector co-financing estimate is conservative as we have found it difficult in the past to obtain formal co-financing letters from private companies as they are not familiar with GEF co-financing terminology and requirements. Nevertheless, we have reviewed and revised the private sector estimates to give more clarity on potential private co-financing and reflect the early interest. We have separately identified a potential PTT co-financing contribution via the mangrove ecology learning centre at Pranburi Estuary, and increased the potential co-financing from tourism operators/hoteliers to allow for national partner engagement. To date, co-financing discussions with private sector have been centred on the tourism sector in Prachuap Khiri Khan (e.g. Chiva Som, Evazon, Prachuab hotels) who have expressed interest in the proposed project. Private sector partnerships, including national-level commitments, will be explored further during the PPG stage as the project outputs and activities are formulated in more detail.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

Please fill in the programming of funds.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

The programming of funds has been completed in the portal.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

Yes, but see comment above.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

The programming of funds has been completed in the portal.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

Yes, but see comment above.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

The programming of funds has been completed in the portal.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

Yes, but please fill in the programming of funds.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

The programming of funds has been completed in the portal.

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Thank you for the clarification and revision on 4.1. Please see comments to be considered during PPG.

Thank you for splitting the Sam Roi Yot NP across core indicators 1 and 2. The use of the same METT score to report Sam Roi Yot NP's marine and terrestrial components under core indicators 2 and 1, respectively, is well noted. Please be explicit about that in future reporting.

Cleared.

JS 11/4/2019

Thank you for the clarifications. Given the explanation provided, please consider revising the target for core indicator 4.1 as the project will act on tourism, which is not the only economic activity in the targeted landscape, and will thus probably not have a direct impact on all of its 97,040 ha.

JS 10/23/2019

Please, as required for core indicator 4.1, qualitatively describe the benefit provided to biodiversity through a change in management over the target 97,040 ha.

While we understand that simplicity is of the essence, please split the terrestrial and marine components of Khao Sam Roi Yot NP and report them in core indicators 1 and 2, respectively.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

Pranburi Estuary has been included as it is such a significant ecological area within Prachuap Khiri Khan. The area is at risk from unsustainable/poorly-developed tourism (e.g. potential loss or degradation of mangroves, disturbance to significant nesting bird populations and sensitive species). To ensure the project can have measurable impact within the budget available, the target area for Pranburi Estuary has been reduced to a core coastal area of an indicative 1,000 ha covering significant mangrove habitats that are at risk from tourism development and operations. The broader 97,040 ha of Pranburi River corridor will remain a broader indirect impact area, but project activities and indicators will target the 1,000 ha core. The benefits of the project's effort at Pranburi Estuary will be avoided ecological impacts from tourism and increased site management and controls. This has been clarified in the indicators for Outcome 2 and added to the text below Table F, and the core area size reflected in the target for core indicator 4.1. The exact delineation of this site and the methodologies and indicators to assess improved management will be finalized during the PPG phase.

As requested, the area of Khao Sam Roi Yot NP has been split across core indicators 1 and 2. However, we note that this site will only have one METT completed at the whole PA level, and the same METT score will be repeated against the two core indicators.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Thank you for your answer. Please investigate climate co-benefits during PPG and do not hesitate to update the Rio markers at CEO endorsement request accordingly, providing a clear justification for the Rio marker rating.

Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

Please clarify why the project is tagged under climate change and Rio markers for climate change adaptation and mitigation when the PIF says on page 16 that "opportunities to also [...] incorporate climate change adaptation and mitigation [...] will be explored" and climate is not mentioned in project activities.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

The tagging of the Rio markers has been revised. Climate change adaptation and mitigation co-benefits will still both be explored during project development, but as this is not currently written into the PIF as a significant objective both Rio markers have been revised to (0).

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/23/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/23/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Thank you for the clarifications and modifications. Cleared.

JS 10/24/2019

Please explain your theory of change in this section and in particular how the project plans to contribute to biodiversity mainstreaming in the tourism sector and not just to developing niche biodiversity-friendly tourism since BD-1-1 is about biodiversity mainstreaming and not creation of niche markets. Justify why most of the projects' activities and budget seems to be devoted to the development of niche biodiversity-friendly tourism. The project's assumption seems to be that developing and demonstrating successful biodiversity-based tourism is a prerequisite to mainstreaming but please articulate this point explicitly. Part of the confusion may be arising from the use of the term "biodiversity-based", which could mean biodiversity-friendly tourism or all tourism, including unsustainable tourism, that uses biodiversity in some way. Please consider clarifying terms or reformulating.

In component 2, please clarify who would be the beneficiaries of the new revenue generation options, and in particular to what extent they are PAs as it seems to be the intention (p14).

In component 3, please clarify :

-how the app's development and maintenance after the end of the project is to be funded and the overall budget planned for that. Significant co-funding from the government and/or the private-sector would be needed as buy-in is key for this type of activity to be useful. Please clarify whether citizen science tools would be developed from scratch or if partnerships/integration with existing successful apps will be secured (e.g., iNaturalist, PlantNet, etc.)

- how, under a 48-month project, the outreach and educational campaign of output 3.2 would be able to focus on showcasing the demonstration in the project targeted landscape.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

As described earlier, the project's theory of change and approaches have been better defined and added to the description of the project's alternative scenario. The mainstreaming emphasis of the project and national and provincial levels is hopefully now clearer, as is the project's reflection of the key mainstreaming approaches outlined in the GEF-7 programming directions. The term 'biodiversity-based' tourism has been retained as this is a well-adopted term within Thailand. However, to increase clarity, the broad use of the term is now mentioned in the PIF, and in numerous places it has been complimented by other terms that also reflect the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into tourism (e.g. biodiversity-friendly tourism, biodiversity-compatible tourism). The development of community-based, biodiversity-friendly tourism is just one part of the overall project approach. It is indeed an assumption that successful mainstreaming of biodiversity within Thailand's tourism strategy and operations will require the demonstration of benefits from biodiversity, including economic benefits for local communities in line with the government's priority to use community ecotourism to address income inequality and poverty. This has been made explicit in the PIF.

Under Component 2, 'revenue generation' refers to mechanisms to generate revenue for biodiversity conservation at the project sites. Revenue generation mechanisms will be applied at each of the three sites under revised Output 2.2. This will depend on the specific context for each site. For example, revenue generation may be

through increased/revised visitor/tourism revenue for the two PAs which have existing fee collection mechanisms. For Pranburi Estuary which does not have an existing revenue generation mechanism the project will look into development of user charges and establishment of a community trust fund to manage and disburse these funds for community-led biodiversity conservation efforts. This approach will be confirmed during PPG phase based on the BIOFIN model for Koh Tao island. As needed, tourism capacity assessments will be applied to determine the optimum level for tourism and in what form, which will in turn inform the potential revenue generation mechanisms. This is hopefully now clearer through the revision and rearrangement of the outputs under Component 2. Improved community livelihoods is also a desired outcome of the project, although this is not captured under the use of the term revenue generation in the PIF which is specifically used to refer to revenue generation for biodiversity conservation.

Under Component 3 the following clarifications and revisions have been made:

-The maintenance of the proposed application after the project will be covered by government co-financing. The project is proposing to build upon an existing Thai government application (supported by MOTs) for the exact reason that the app is already being maintained by the Thai government. The GEF funds will be used to build new functionality into the app and bring together information on biodiversity with tourism marketing. The project will focus on integration and expansion of existing tools rather than develop new applications. This will be confirmed during the PPG phase when existing apps and platforms are reviewed, partnerships explored, and project activities and budget are defined. The commitment of government to cover maintenance of any applications through co-financing will be confirmed during the PPG phase as activities are developed and this commitment will be clearly recorded in the Project Document. This has been made explicit in the output description.

-The terminology for the proposed outreach and education under Output 3.2 has been revised to use ‘mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism’ language as this better reflects the broader intent of this output to: (i) raise awareness and understanding of the tourism sector on why it is important to consider biodiversity conservation and protect biodiversity assets that underpin tourism; and (ii) raise understanding of domestic and international tourists of the potential impacts of their visit on biodiversity, and of potential tourism providers/products/sites that minimize/offset potential negative impacts on biodiversity and bring about positive socio-economic and ecological benefits. The sentence on showcasing landscape demonstrations has been deleted as it was misleading – rather this output will seek to reflect project outputs/approaches as they are developed (e.g. raising tourism industry awareness of standards and monitoring protocols developed by the project which they can adopt to reduce their impacts on biodiversity). The mention of communities and CSOs has been removed from this output as it is better captured under the reformulated Component 2.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/24/2019

The project has the strong potential to be aligned with BD-1-1, provided comments II.3, I.1 and I.2 are addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

Please see the earlier responses to comments.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/24/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

While the project maintains a target landscape of more than 100,000 ha PA and 97,040 ha non PA, target for core indicator 4.1 has been revised down to 1,000 ha from 97,040 ha to reflect area where the project will have direct, measurable impact. Please pay special attention to core indicator 4.1 as part of the PPG work related to core indicator target consolidation. We are conscious of the difficulty of measuring impact of biodiversity mainstreaming in the tourism sector on a hectare basis. While impact will never be on the full 97,040 ha of the target landscape, please consider, as project interventions are more precisely defined within that landscape, developing ways to measure the project's mainstreaming impact beyond the core 1,000 ha of the Pranburi Estuary and revising the target upward accordingly.

JS 10/24/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/24/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

The shape files do not seem to have been uploaded. If there is an issue with uploading at the moment, please make sure they are uploaded with CEO endorsement request.

Cleared.

JS 10/24/2019

Maps are provided. Please provide coordinates or the shape files that are announced in PIF but do not seem to have been uploaded.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

This was an omission when the project was submitted through the portal. The shapefiles are included with the resubmission. Note that the third project site, Pranburi Estuary, is not a PA and the shapefile provided is indicative only at this stage, covering the broader Pranburi area. The site will be further delineated to reflect the core area of during PPG phase based on site visits and local consultations. Revised shapefiles will be provided at the time of CEO Endorsement.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/24/2019

There is a typo on the name of the Petroleum Authority of Thailand, which seems to be actually called PTT Public Company Limited nowadays.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

This has been corrected in the stakeholder table. The old name has also been retained to provide sufficient clarity for all readers on who PTT is.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/24/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/24/2019

Most of the text concerns private sector in the target landscape. Please clarify plans to engage the private sector outside of the target sites for the development of standards and tools that can be replicated or for up-scaling / replication itself.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

During the PPG phase, there will be broader consultation with the tourism sector across Thailand to leverage private sector engagement and support the materialization of co-financing. During PIF development this has focussed on Prachuap Khiri Khan where BEDO has been able to confirm local private sector support which has supported the selection of the demonstration landscape. Broader consultation with the national tourism sector will be done through relevant national tourism associations to leverage their convening power. Consultation with key tourism operators that could be potential project ‘champions’ and early adopters will also take place during PPG. As project activities are developed in detail these will as far as possible seek to align to and build off existing government initiatives for tourism (e.g. DEQP Green Hotel Scheme, MOI Nawat Withi community ecotourism scheme) as these already have private sector engagement and networks. Existing initiatives and potential alignment to the project will be mapped during the PPG phase. Additional text outlining this approach has been added to the private sector engagement section of the PIF and under relevant outputs. In addition, national tourism associations that will be consulted during PPG stage have been added to the stakeholder table.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/24/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/23/2019

Please include in this section the description the possible coordination with all relevant project, including BIOFIN and the relevant GEF projects mentioned on page 11.

We note that the PIF mentions " at this stage, the government has indicated that it will not need to request for UNDP to provide executing support for the project". As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

Coordination with relevant projects (e.g. BIOFIN, GEF-financed projects) that are expected to still be operational when this project commences implementation has been added to Section 6. Key thematic areas for coordination have been noted, yet specific mechanisms for coordination will need to be finalized during the PPG phase when project activities and budget are defined.

The GEF fee policy and restrictions on GEF Agencies providing executing support services are well-noted. Detailed discussions with BEDO on implementation arrangements will commence early in the PPG phase. Should BEDO indicate that it requires executing support for the implementation of this project, the use of third-party providers will be included within the overall assessment of options.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/24/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 10/24/2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Cleared.

JS 10/22/2019

The letter of endorsement we received for this project was signed by the previous OFP, who was OFP at the time of submission. It is thus valid. Please make nonetheless sure that the current OFP (Mr. Jatuporn Buruspat) is aware and in agreement with the project.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 4 November 2019

Noted. The project implementing partner, BEDO, has met and briefed the new OFP and Permanent Secretary of MONRE, Mr. Jatuporn Burutpat, on this project and he has expressed his full support for it.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of

generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

The project is recommended for technical clearance.

JS 10/24/2019

The PIF is not recommended for clearance at this stage. Please address GEFSEC comments and resubmit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 11/5/2019

Please during PPG:

- consolidate co-funding, in particular from the private sector and the tourism fund created by the May 2019 National Tourism Policy Act;
- investigate the possibility to deliver climate co-benefits.
- pay special attention to core indicator 4.1 as part of the PPG work related to core indicator target consolidation. We are conscious of the difficulty of measuring impact of biodiversity mainstreaming in the tourism sector on a hectare basis. While impact will not be on the full 97,040 ha of the target non-PA landscape, please consider, as project interventions are more precisely defined within that landscape, developing ways to measure the project's mainstreaming impact beyond the cor 1,000 ha of the Pranburi Estuary and revising the target upward accordingly.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		