

Strengthening Thailand's institutional and technical capacities to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10150

Countries

Thailand

Project Name

Strengthening Thailand's institutional and technical capacities to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

11/17/2020

Review completed by PM

3/15/2021

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Yes, it remains aligned with the GEF focal area strategy while there are changes on the focus of the project.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, March 15, 2021: Clearer justifications on additional resources in the Component 1 including the detailed studies and activities in Output 1.3 as a priority of the country were provided. Comment cleared.

SY, February 27, 2021: The second comment is cleared.

It is still unclear how much additional resources are needed to strengthen capacity building in the targeted activities from the PIF stage on Component 1. For instance, the planned budget of the development of EF of the energy sector seems to be USD232,750 according to the budget table (Annex I-1), but this activity was already envisaged at the PIF stage. How much are the additional resources from what envisaged at the PIF stage with what additional activities (the publication of the guideline seems to be the only activity related to sustainability beyond the project timeline)? The same question applies to the development of EF of the livestock sector and agricultural soils (there are some trainings). The total amount under the EF activities (output 1.3) is USD694,000, even without the EF of IPPU that was planned at the PIF, and this is well beyond the budget of the Component 1 (USD480,000) at the PIF stage.

The below response includes "the trainings would be more intense to ensure that agencies are well equipped to implement the mandate" but it is not clear how much resources are needed with what additional trainings will be provided to achieve what improvements.

Please describe or attach a supplemental document with a table that explains additional activities and additional budget from the PIF stage with descriptions on why such activities are needed and why such additional resources are necessary.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: It is generally preferable that the project prioritizes what has not been addressed given that a number of donor-funded activities have been implemented in Thailand in this area to avoid duplication of work. However, please clarify the below points. Also please see comments in the alternative scenario box.

? Project financing on Component 1 has significantly increased while narrowing down the focused sectors. There is an explanation that ?fieldwork and data collection, trainings, efforts and public consultations compared to others, and at a much more intense level than what was envisioned during the PIF stage.? However, the levels of increased activities to achieve the objective of the project are not clear compared with at the PIF stage. Public consultations are not fully described under this component. Trainings are described but should be explained in relation to the decreased number of beneficiaries.

? Only the agricultural sector is covered in Component 2 as considered to be included in the next NDC while the current NDC says excluding the LULUCF sector as a whole. Please clarify why it is not necessary to include the whole AFOLU sector (e.g. Forest) in this component.

Agency Response

March 15, 2021

At the PIF stage, the intent of the activity was to undertake a small sample based emission factor estimation to improve the GHG inventory estimates. Further though consultations were undertaken the estimates were not detailed and based on best judgement of the costs. During the PPG consultation stage it was agreed that rather than

undertaking a smaller sample based estimation of EF, which though would improve upon the default emission factors used for GHG inventory, it would still not present a very accurate representations of the difference across the country, especially in the agriculture and livestock sector where the representative nature of small sample based estimation might still be highly uncertain. Further, as AFLOU sector is being considered for inclusion in the next NDC and may be included in the updated NDC Government of Thailand is preparing, it was considered that the emission factor estimation work should cover the variations across the agro-climatic zones of the country to provide a better baseline emission for the two sectors and enable more accurate estimate of emissions reductions from the mitigation actions in the sector. We also found that out of the five sectors proposed at the PIF stage, the institutional arrangements, human capacities and overlap of agencies in the AFOLU sector with regard to GHG inventories (addressed in Output 1.1) are most complex. The AFOLU sector is a priority sector in the Thai context as it employs one third of the country's labour force and is a major economic factor, as Thailand is a large exporter of agricultural commodities. These efforts will strengthen, in line with Paris Agreement and CBIT objectives, the capacities to establish accurate baseline for the sectors, develop ambitious mitigation reduction, and accurately estimate the emission reductions achieved from these sectors.

The activities within this component are of a much greater depth than the ones at the PIF stage, particularly on the fieldwork and data collection of aerial photography and satellite imagery (Output 1.2) and the development of local emissions factors for selected fuels within Energy, Manure management and Agricultural soils (Output 1.3).

In regard to Output 1.3, the below table details the activities needed for the defined resources as indicated in the CEOED. This will include mapping the process and technologies used and undertaking actual measurements to collect the necessary data to determine country specific emission factors in these sectors. Please also note the in view of the greater details of the work under Output 1.3, the co-finance for component 1 was increased from 260,000 USD to 1,119,557 USD. This reflects the level of effort that ONEP anticipates in undertaking the work.

Budget at PIF stage <i>Component level</i>	Budget at CEOED stage		Foreseen Activities
	<i>Output level</i>	<i>Activity level</i>	
USD 230,000 (Co-finance for Component 1 - 260,000 USD)	USD 694,000 (Output 1.3 only) (Co-finance Component 1 - 1,119,557 USD)	Activity 1.3.1 In collaboration with local experts, develop country-specific emission pool for agricultural soils (USD 313,750)	The aim is to develop a 'Soil Carbon Emission Map' to establish the baseline of soil inventory covering the entire country. Extensive fieldwork and research activities for the development of the data pool specifically for the purposes of soil carbon emissions assessment are to be conducted. Some specific activities include: Collection of approx. 300 samplings aligned with soil series across the country Soil carbon analysis of all samplings

		<p>Activity 1.3.2 In collaboration with local experts, develop relevant data set for the establishment of country-specific emission factors for the manure management in Livestock sector (USD 147,500)</p>	<p>Manure management is the second largest source of GHG emissions in the sector.</p> <p>For the development of a country-specific emission factor for ?Manure Management? (for nitrous oxide and partially for methane emissions) thorough fieldwork and research will be conducted. The activity will cover the followings aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 types of animal including dairy cattle, beef cattle, buffalo, swine and poultry 3 management systems 4 regions across the country 3 seasons for each region
		<p>Activity 1.3.3 In collaboration with local experts, develop country-specific emission factors for selected fuels in Energy sector (USD 232,750)</p>	<p>The identified category for emission factor development in the Energy sector relates firstly to fossil fuels, covering the below types. Specifically, the objective of this activity is to update the data on (i) Carbon content, and (ii) Net Calorific Value (NCV) to support the development of country-specific emission factors in this sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crude oil Condensate Natural gas LPG Gasoline Diesel JET A1 Fuel oil Lignite Imported coal <p>Primarily, the project aims to collect available data from both public and private key organisations, plus samplings as necessary depending on the accessibility and quality of data acquired. Note that, since the standard and required parameters of fuel assessment could vary according to fuel types, the exact number of samplings rely upon not only the available and accessible data, but also the individual-fuel assessment method.</p> <p>Other renewables and biofuels will be considered as much as the remaining budget allowed.</p>

On the increased levels of activities as compared with the PIF stage, the project preparation stage revealed the realistic magnitude of the resource and labour intensity of the core of the activities of Component 1, and specifically the (i) satellite mapping of forest and non-forest sector, (ii) estimation of the soil carbon emission, and (iii) emission factors in energy sector and livestock subsector at the national level, particularly if, as it is the case, activities are designed to ensure sustainability well beyond the term of the project. It also revealed the need to attract significant international technical expertise in the topics. Hence, to enhance the national capacity in these areas, it was redesigned to reallocate more funding from CBIT project toward the Component 1.

The public consultations refers to consultations of direct stakeholders in the administration who will be responsible for implementing the systems. The wider public will not be directly engaged in this project through public consultations, rather the results will be made publicly available. References to 'public' consultations have been deleted. However, throughout the course of project implementation, national experts working in this field would be part of consultation through workshops and working meetings.

On the number of beneficiaries of trainings, it has decreased because the sectors covered are narrower compared to the PIF, but the trainings would be more intense to ensure that agencies are well equipped to implement the mandate. Under this Component, the sectorial guidelines, templates and tools for data collection will enhance, harmonize and streamline the overall data collection processes from the multiple ministries and agencies involved in the AFOLU streams of the GHG inventory preparation, with a view to strengthen data flow, consistency and comparability. These guidelines and templates, complemented with a training provided to key staff in the different agencies, will support building in-house capacity over time and support timely and accurate preparation of future GHG inventory. Thus, the provision of training, which at the PIF stage was considered to include stakeholders outside the administration, will be particularly and intensively provided to existing staff, as well as new staff, of key departments and ministries that are responsible for supporting the data collection and GHG inventory preparation in order to ensure the sustainability of those capacity building activities over time.

On the focus of Component 2 on Agriculture only: For the AFOLU sector, Thailand has divided the methodology for national GHG inventory estimation into agriculture sector and LULUCF sector. The agriculture sector is the second largest emissions producer in Thailand (14.72%). Given the early stage of mitigation tracking in the agriculture sector,

the government of Thailand wants to focus on this sector first. Non-evidence-based policies towards emissions reductions in the agriculture sector may affect many farmers in Thailand, including livelihoods and development. Additionally, Thailand has already received the support from the World Bank in order to develop Forest reference (emission) levels (FRL/FREL) as well as REDD+ strategy, which could help Thailand identify potential measures of LULUCF sector in the future (see CEO Endorsement Document, Table 3).

This explanation above is also reflected in the Section 1a: Changes in Project Design

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, March 18, 2021: Thank you for the reallocation of the co-financing. Comment cleared.

SY, March 17, 2021: Please address the below additional comment.

On Proportionality of PMC: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 8.5%, for a co-financing of \$1,927,293 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$163,811 instead of \$100,000 (which is 5.19%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach the same level.

SY, Feb 27, 2021: The co-financing letter is uploaded with the co-financing amount increased. We note that the PMC co-financing remains the same but is slightly smaller than the ratio of GEF funding of PMCs. Please adjust (and the letter) or provide a

justification that the combined amount of PMCs is suitable for this project, given the updated guidelines on the GEF project and program cycle policy (page 49).

Also, table 2 was not revised based on the updated co-financing on the portal and ProDoc. Please address.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Please upload a co-financing letter from the government.

Agency Response

March 18, 2021

The Co-finance for PMC has been increased to 170,000 USD

March 15, 2021

Thanks for the Feedback. The EA has provided a substantial co-finance from ONEP and other partner agencies who directly benefit from the project in strengthening the ETF though for CBIT projects it is not a requirement. This has been done to capture the level of effort ONEP and other key partner agencies responsible for various work will be putting in by leading the technical work and managing the work within their sphere of responsibility. CBIT project is taken by Government of Thailand as an important initiative towards meeting its obligations under the Convention and the Paris Agreement. ONEP will of be responsible for overall project management and will take responsibility for its delivery. ONEP will provide all the time and effort to successfully implement the project. The co-financing for PMC reflects only the ONEP part of managing the project, but this won't be defining the limits on ONEPs time to delivering the project successfully. Further, it should be noted that the co-finance for PMC has been raised from 50,000 USD in the PIF to 100,000 USD in the full proposal. This was done to ensure adequate resources for Project management.

February 23, 2021

The Co-finance letter is uploaded.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Dec 8, 2020: Yes. it will utilize the past and current transparency activities and experiences. Please see the comment on the financing on Component 1.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

The financing on component 1 is addressed in section 2 above.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SY, Dec 8, 2020: Yes. The total number of beneficiaries has decreased by half due to the changes in the project design.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

The explanation on changes in beneficiary is provided in section 2 above.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Comment addressed.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Please also provide information relating to the current ONEP system for tracking support.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

In the existing web-based tracking system, ONEP inputs and adjusts raw data received, such as project information, budget received, donors, project duration and implementation status, from agencies, which after processing can be viewed by the wider public and donors. This basic system is useful to obtain a basic overview of the main items of support received, but needs further review on the accuracy of data and the potential development to meet the requirements set forth in the MPGs, particularly those beyond the basic ones. Moreover, with the current system it is difficult to verify the transparency of support information provided as well as support received from data owner agencies. The CBIT funding will allow a collaborative development of reporting format, which will help in checking back between agencies, avoiding double counting, and help in reporting the information international support received in BTR. The outputs will result in better systems to track continuously the resources allocated to different climate action, assess the gaps and overlaps in the financing and appropriately allocate resources for different sector.

This additional information is now reflected in the baseline section of the document.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SY, March 15, 2021: Clarifications were provided. Comment cleared.

SY, Feb 27, 2021: The remaining points are the below.

1. Please clarify and include descriptions on how the project will help Thailand address the time gap between inventory year and reporting year (X-2 or X-3 by the first BTR in 2024) and time series of inventory (from 1990 or using the flexibility mechanism by the first BTR) from the status of the Third BUR. If other donor-funded projects support

these other than the AFOLU sector, please explain. Please also describe how this project improves transparency of Thailand overtime after the first BTR, if applicable.

2. Component 4 (national information gateway) Please provide details on the type of outreach that will be conducted to increase number of users and for the information to be user friendly (the previous comment was not fully addressed).

SY, Dec 8, 2020: The proposed alternative scenario is comprehensive. However, please address/clarify the below points.

? Overall: Please add a theory of change of the project.

? Since the inclusion of the Agriculture sector in Thailand's NDC is not anticipated until 2025, please comment on how the CBIT project, which is expected to end in 2024, will contribute to the first BTR due in 2024. (i.e. concrete results that the CBIT project may deliver prior to the inclusion of the new NDC from Thailand).

? Component 1: The CBIT project is expected to enable the country to meet the requirements of Article 13 and its MPGs as described in the document. Please provide further information on the gaps between the current capacity of the country and the requirements of MPGs on top of information in the table 6, and how such gaps will be addressed by this project or by other activities before the first BTR (for example, narrowing time gap between the reporting year and the inventory year and methodologies improvements (tier) in sectors other than AFOLU).

? Component 1 and 2: The project covers mainly the AFOLU sector or the agricultural sector in the whole GHGI and MRV system. It is thus critical that outputs produced by this project will be fully integrated in the whole transparency systems while there are other activities supported by other donors. For instance, Output 1.4 will develop QA/QC methodologies and system for the forestry sector, which may need to be linked with other QA/QC methodologies and systems for other sectors in the TGEIS. Please clarify how the project will ensure such integrations. Specifically, please provide a comment on the sequencing of these integrations especially since energy and other sectors are more advanced than that of the agriculture sector.

? Output 1.1.3: While there is some explanation on the inclusion of the Energy sector under Output 1.1.3 based on stakeholder consultations, elaborate further on the rationale, especially since the AFOLU sector technical needs are very different from that of the energy sector. Please comment if any of the other transparency-related initiatives are developing emissions factors for the energy sector, and how this CBIT project will avoid duplication of efforts if that is the case.

? Output 1.1 and 2.1: We note the focus on institutional arrangements with the latter focusing on only the open burning practice. Please comment on how linkages with other initiatives that focus on the AFOLU sector related to mitigation actions will be addressed or coordinated with. For example, does the project envision specific institutional arrangements for open burning practices alone? And how would this result in a cohesive transparency arrangement.

? Activity 2.1.2: Please elaborate this activity as it seems like this would be included within the previous component focused on inventories.

? Component 3 calls for the development of web-based templates etc. Please comment on resource requirements for this component specifically on the project financing amount allocated to it.

? Component 4: it mentions a national information gateway for the agriculture sector related to adaptation tracking. Please explain if this will integrate other sectors, and if so what efforts will be made to do so. Also please provide comment on what type of outreach would be conducted to increase the number of users, and make the information user friendly.

? Component 4: We note that this component focuses on tools and human capacities. Please comment on if institutional arrangements for adaptation in the agriculture sector will be addressed in this component and if it is being addressed by other initiatives. Please elaborate on any interlinkages and coordination that might be anticipated.

? Activity 4.2.2 calls for establishing a database / national information gateway. Please comment on the resources required to deliver this, especially considering the project financing allocated for this.

Agency Response

March 15, 2021

1. BTR requirement: Thanks for the feedback. The proposal was prepared and aligns fully with the GEF Focal Area Climate Mitigation 3 ? 8 ? Foster enabling conditions for mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies through capacity building initiative for transparency?. It's primary effort is to strengthen the ETF system and help Government of Thailand meet its obligations of reporting under the Convention and the Paris Agreement. It is recognized that BTR reporting will enhance the requirements compared to the BUR. Some of the BTR requirements are already addressed in the third BUR of Thailand. Government of Thailand has submitted 3 BURs, there are only a few developing countries that have submitted 3 or more BURs. Government of Thailand is committed to meeting its obligations under the Paris agreement. As explained in Table 6 the various outputs of the Project will enable country meet different requirements of BTR. They key challenge, which was the same as was with BUR reporting is related to systems and process that expands the responsibility to wider set of government agencies and continuity. CBIT work, along with the support received from other projects explained in the baseline section, will strengthen the institutional mechanism of establishing the clear roles and responsibilities, formalize these mandates, build necessary tools as well as capacities to ensure that there is timely and regular flow of information to enable regular BTR submissions as per the requirements. By creating clear mandate for all relevant agencies whose support is needed in reporting as well as clarity of information required, and capacity do so will enable reduce the time between reporting year and inventory year. The work of CBIT and other support projects will also look at the timelines of primary data collection, their verification and approval by appropriate authorities and its implications on the gap between reporting year and inventory year. All efforts that will

be made within the mandate of ONEP as its role in coordination of the reporting process to meet the BTR requirement of X-2 reporting of inventory. Thailand third BUR already has included information on GHG time series from 2000. This was done through the resources provided for preparing the BUR. The extension of timeseries for historic data will again be undertaken as part of BTR and focus of CBIT is to strengthen systems to fully meet requirements of future reporting both on GHG inventory and NDC tracking. The BUR reports on 3 gases and HFCs will be reported through the BUR4 and NC under preparation. The emissions from PFCs and SF6 are very small compared to total emissions. Nonetheless the Government will make all effort to meet the requirement of reporting on the gases listed in the MPG.

2. Component 4: In pursuit of integrating adaptation issues in climate change plans/measures/strategies, the outreach will be produced in the forms of training materials, guidelines and methodological framework for reporting, monitoring and evaluation of climate change impacts and adaptation in the Agriculture sector. These outreaches will also be available in both hard and soft copies. The latter will be made available and accessible online not only for relevant government officials but also for wider stakeholders.

February 23, 2021

On Theory of Change: As requested, the TOC is attached as a separate document in the portal.

Impact of CBIT support to Agriculture on BTR: the results of this project will crucially contribute to the implementation of a robust MRV system in the agriculture sector. It will do so through the institutionalization of processes, procedures, templates and tools as well as the strengthening of the national GHG inventory via much needed nationally developed emissions factors. This will enhance and upgrade the IPCC Tier for inventory estimation in the BTR and result in more accurate estimation at national level. Although the agricultural sector will be included in second NDC, the project outputs will help in reporting ongoing activities in agriculture sector in first BTR that may not be primarily designed to reduce GHG emissions, but do result in reducing GHG emissions. For example, activity in agriculture sector to reduce crop burning which is designed to help reduce air pollution also helps reduce GHG emissions. Moreover, the timing of the end of the CBIT project will fit well with the timing of the preparation of the Second NDC, a process typically spanning several months, as well as reporting of agriculture sectors for subsequent BTRs.

On Component 1, how the project addresses barriers and gaps: new additional information on existing gaps and how upcoming activities will contribute to addressing them has been provided below.

On Component 1 and 2, integration of CBIT outputs into overall transparency system: There are a number of ongoing GHGI and MRV projects funded by donors and are listed and explained in Tables 4 and 5. ONEP is the main counterpart of most of these initiatives and plays a significant part in all as the national focal point on climate change agenda and will ensure the smooth and complete integration of all efforts into the whole transparency systems. For example, currently, GIZ under the Thai-German Climate Programme (TGCP) is helping the Climate Policy Project to support capacity development to prepare the first biennial transparency report due in 2024. The Quality Control (QC) of Activity Data (AD) is crucial for improving the quality and transparency of National GHG Inventory for NC and BUR, as well as the BTR in the future. To improve QC of AD in each sector the project aims to develop QC template to perform the QC of AD and to add on this part to MRV Handbook of GHG inventory of each sector. At this stage, the QC template of energy and waste sectors have been prepared to be used by related agencies. Thus the activities funded by CBIT project will be built upon the initial QC procedure development under the GIZ project. The TGIES system is designed as an add-on architecture mode to enable addition of additional modules. The contractors will work with the existing system and developed modules aligned with TGIES. As these modules can be added independently the sequencing will not affect the integration.

This is included in the section 6 ?Institutional Arrangement and Coordination?.

Output 1.1.3, rationale of inclusion of energy sector and avoiding duplication of efforts: The development of country specific EFs for the main fuels in the energy sector was identified as the key need in the TNC . This was included in the PIF as one of the activities, which CBIT resources will address. At the time of the CBIT proposal development, there was only one donor-supported project to develop a local emission factor (EF), related to municipal wastewater. There are no current initiatives to support work on EF on fuels that is included under the deliverable 1.1.3.

Output 1.1 and 2.1, on linkages with other AFOLU activities: Currently ONEP is responsible for coordination under the guidance of the National Committee on Climate Change Policy (NCCC). ONEP thus is the integrator of all the actions related to preparation of GHG inventory and NDC tracking as well as reporting. The institutional arrangements being developed AFOLU sector are thus linked to the overall institutional arrangement with ONEP at the apex.

On Activity 2.1.2 placement in component 2: Activity 2.1.2 aims to focus on the development of processes and procedures for data collection, reporting, and quality control for estimating GHG emission reductions from ?open burning reduction

measures? as mitigation measure. On the other hand, Component 1 focuses on enhancing the inventory data collection procedure for the forestry sector.

On Component 3, resource requirements: acknowledging the importance of transparency of support received/needed, ONEP has initiated the development of a database system for international support needed and received. The system has been up and running with different levels of accessibility. One is mainly by the administrative persons (ONEP) responsible for inputting and adjusting raw data. The other is for wider public and donors to view the final data, information and analysis. The data is collected from relevant line agencies and processed by ONEP on annual basis. The CBIT project will build upon this system contributing specifically on adjusting it to the standard of BTR reporting requirements. The project is thus augmenting the existing system and not building a new system. Thus, the allocated resource will be sufficient to fulfil the objective, while the outputs will result in better systems to track continuously the resources allocated to different climate action, assess the gaps and overlaps in the financing and appropriately allocate resources for different sector. This information has been included in the component description in the CEOED.

On Component 4, integration of sectors other than agriculture, and users: the national information gateway will be a web-based platform that collect M&E data on the adaptation actions. The setting of this will be similar to the deliverable of component 3, whereby the audiences could be classified into at least 2 tiers ? for the admin to input the data and adjust the raw data, and for the wider public and donors to see the final data and analysis. However, as Thailand still has no platform for adaptation action, this will be the first initiative for the country. Therefore, this national information gateway aims to start from the adaptation action in agriculture sector first. The Gateway developed will be extended to include other sectors in the future through the implementation of NAP project . NAP project too will be executed under the supervision of ONEP and thus will ensure that all additional work done will be linked to the Gateway developed under CBIT.

This information has been included in the description of Output 4.2 in the CEOED.

On Component 4, institutional arrangements for adaptation in the agriculture sector: There is an existing arrangement on ministerial-level climate change action mechanisms consisting a subcommittee to drive the climate change strategies in agricultural sector, and two working groups on 1) the formulation of academic, strategic and databases on climate change, and 2) the GHG inventory and agricultural mitigation measures development. The first working group will also be responsible for adaptation works in

the sector. Thus, through this existing institutional arrangement, the outputs from this CBIT project will be applied to the adaptation perspective in the sector, for example, the adoption of the training curriculum as one of CBIT project deliverables under Component 4.

On Activity 4.2.2, resources requirement for national gateway database: As clarified before, the national information gateway will be a web-based platform that collect M&E data on the adaptation action. The setting of this will be similar to the deliverable of component 3. The cost of the development of the database has been calculated based on the previous cost charged by a private consulting company for the development of the basis database on which Component 3 will be build. Therefore, we have estimated this budget, taking into account that the database will pertain only to one sector.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response
Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
SY, Feb 27, 2021: Comment addressed.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Yes. Please also include the map of Thailand that covers the project implementation areas.

Agency Response
February 23, 2021

The map of Thailand is included (see figure 2).

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
SY, Feb 27, 2021: Comment cleared.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Yes. However, donor organizations should be included in the stakeholder engagement plan for smooth coordination with similar activities and projects that also improve the transparency framework as a whole. Also please consider

the inclusion of gender-related organization in relation to gender action plan as appropriate. Please see the comment on the private sector engagement.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

The architecture of stakeholder engagement plan in the CEOED focuses on the engagement of implementation bodies since activities in Thailand's CBIT project require several co-working agencies. Donors and other private organizations are to be engaged at output/activity level. Thus, the stakeholder engagement plan for smooth coordination with similar activities is to be outlined as deemed fit to each particular output at implementation stage. Also, since all the donors projects relevant to the CBIT projects are in partnership with ONEP, the coordination of Donors is in-built as ONEP is the Executing Agency (EA) of all project related to MRV and ETF strengthening. The Project Manager will be responsible for engagement with donors of other projects. It has been added in the TOR of the PM. In relation to the inclusion of gender-related organizations, the stakeholder engagement plan includes the Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development (OWAFD), Ministry of Social Development and Human Security. Additional gender-related organizations will be engaged during the development of the Gender Action Plan, and included in the implementation of the project.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, March 18, 2021: Thank you for the clarification as well as adding information on gender analysis relating to transparency. Comments cleared.

SY, March 17, 2021: Please address the below additional comments.

There are some inconsistencies in terms of the information on gender in this submission. In the section on gender, the submission includes information under headings that says (1) gender analysis and (2) gender action plan. The information provided under these headings are, however, superficial. In addition, it states that, during the initial phase of the project implementation period, the project will "conduct a gender analysis and create a Gender Action Plan" for the project. While it is positive that this work will, as stated, be developed in close consultation with the Ministry responsible for women and gender

issues and relevant NGOs, the GEF policy on Gender Equality requires projects to have completed gender analysis prior to CEO endorsement/approval. As such, please request Agency to provide further clarity on the gender analysis to date and or any justifications on the delayed gender analysis

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Please ensure to include other gender-sensitive indicators other than the core indicator at the earliest stage of the implementation.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Largely yes, as gender analysis and gender action plan are provided. However, there is no gender-sensitive indicators included (as in a stand-alone framework or in the project results framework).

Agency Response

March 18, 2021

Gender assessment of all key project outputs was carried out to identify potential of gender integration. This formed the basis for the gender actions suggested in the CEO document. This additional information on gender assessment at the stage of PPG is added to the CEO ED. The action plan provides the areas that need to be addressed at the project implementation. Further resources are provided for a gender expert to implement the gender action plan and provide further details of specific actions based on the outputs of each of the components, specifically working with the component 3 & 4 related to adaptation and climate finance tracking. The Gender expert will build upon the outcomes of the Gender responsive climate change benefit analysis (ICCBA) project which is being implemented by UNDP. The project is undertaking research activities in two provinces to assess the socioeconomic dimensions of climate change impacts (e.g. sex, age, education, health, livelihood, and employment) and develop participatory climate budget formulation at the community level through participatory research and multi-stakeholder engagement. The CBIT project Gender Expert will use this information to mainstream gender aspects in outputs of the CBIT projects. The ICCBA project is likely to finish by December 2021.

March

To ensure gender equality and sensitivity throughout the project implementation phases, the undertaking of the following activities will be ensured :

- ? Identification and approach of gender gaps in participatory processes;
- ? Promote the national and local participation of women in decision-making according to their roles and responsibilities in public organizations related to the project.
- ? Include gender-disaggregated data gathering specially in context of the mitigation and adaptation action tracking to better inform gender responsive climate policies, plans, strategies and actions related to this project.

- ? Avoid gender stereotypes in all training material, employ inclusive language and use appropriate illustrations;
- ? Encourage women representation during capacity building workshops (both, among trainers and training participants) to promote gender parity;
- ? Address gender in the project team and stakeholder meetings, to help identify other areas where gender goals could be established.

However, ONEP and the PMU will ensure that once the gender action plan is developed in the initiation of the project, the PRF will be updated.

February 23, 2021

The project results framework includes "the Indicator C: C1. Number of persons trained, and C2. percentage of persons trained that are women." Moreover, the Gender Action Plan will identify additional gender-sensitive indicator and therefore they will be integrated into the project execution

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Comment cleared.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: There's no direct engagement with the private sector while justifications of non-engagement on agriculture and forestry sectors are provided. However, producing emissions factors of fuels may require accurate information held by the private sector (the energy sector), for instance.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

The sectoral working group for GHG inventory preparation comprises public and private agencies, which can request data through each sectoral working group. DEDE, the agency who is responsible for this activity, routinely requests data from private companies regarding use of fossil fuels such as natural gas, oil and coal, and is planning to set up technical working group which include private sectors during the project implementation period for review and consider related information such as heating

value, carbon content and EF. This is reflected in the CEO ED document in Private Sector Engagement Section.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Comment cleared.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Largely yes. Please also consider the risk that other activities on non-agricultural sectors would not achieve the results as planned and/or the coordination with such activities would not be smoothly implemented, and thus the overall institutional arrangements and GHGI and MRV systems would not be fully improved.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

Many thanks, this risk has been included in the CEO Endorsement Document (Table 9)

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Yes. Please see the comments on coordination with other projects in the relevant boxes.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

The comments in other boxes related to Coordination has been addressed at relevant places and where required integrated in the CEO Endorsement document.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Comment cleared.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Yes, however, how the project will learn from lessons learned of previous projects and experiences including those in other countries can be elaborated, other than participating in the CBIT Global Coordination Platform. Please also add timelines for deliverables.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

On lessons learned: the key periodical UNFCCC?s workshop "Regional Training Workshop on the Building of Sustainable National Greenhouse Gas Inventory Management Systems, and the Use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories for the Asia-Pacific and the Eastern Europe Regions", organised annually, would serve as one of the best platform where the Thai government could gather valuable lessons learnt from other countries. In addition, other donor meetings arranged in country may provide additional lessons learnt from other similar and/or related projects. This information has been added into the knowledge management section of the CEO Endorsement Document.

This project will also coordinate with the CBIT Global Support Programme (GSP) through utilization of the knowledge products developed under the GSP and will engage with peer-to-peer exchange through GSP. Furthermore, the CBIT project will coordinate with UN country team in Thailand particularly the UN Resident Coordinator?s Office and team. The CBIT project is aligned with the UNPAF for Thailand, especially with regard to its Outcome Strategy 1 (Collaborate at national and sub-national levels to

strengthen systems, structures and processes for effective, inclusive, and sustainable policymaking and implementation), particularly to fulfil the extent to which implementation of comprehensive measures, plans, strategies, policies, programmes to achieve

low greenhouse gas emission and climate resilient development objectives has improved that is aligned with the CBIT project objective: "Thailand has the necessary capacities and institutional arrangements to comply with the requirements of the Enhanced Transparency Framework."

On timelines for deliverables: the work plan in Annex L specifies timelines for each deliverable.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Feb 27, 2021 Comment addressed.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Please clarify who manages and execute each activity under the M&E plan.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

The roles and responsibilities under the M&E plan are specified in detail in Annex J

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. (Budget table is on the ProDoc)

SY, March 18, 2021: Clarification on the below budget lines is provided. Comment cleared.

March 27, 2021: Please address the below on budget.

125 - Operating & Othr Costs and 130 - Supplies, Commodities & Materials those related to PMCs should be charged to PMCs instead of the main Components. This will change the budget allocation slightly.

Agency Response

March 18, 2021

The budgets included in line 125 and 130 are not related project management operations but direct costs related to delivering the outputs under components. These costs cover the following expenses: acquiring data, IT expenses, materials for undertaking EF estimations, software, rental of experimental equipment, procurement specifications of materials for undertaking work, etc. This will also cover flyers prepared for project work dissemination to wider audience, etc. The PMC related costs of supplies, IT extra will be borne by ONEP through their existing systems and not charged to the project.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, March 15, 2021: Comment addressed.

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Indicator D is still 4 on the portal (on ProDoc it seems zero).

SY, Dec 8, 2020: While MTR is not expected for this project, it may still be useful to have mid-term targets from project management perspectives. If this is already considered, please provide justifications not to have them.
Indicator D ? please clarify why the self-assessment baseline is 4 when this is focused only on the AFOLU sector (since it is not advanced).

Agency Response

March 15, 2021

Addressed in the portal.

February 23, 2021

On mid-term targets: We believe that the continual monitoring and evaluation procedure throughout the entire project timeline and the project implementation arrangement with assigned structure and responsible bodies, consisting of Project Steering Committee (PSC), Technical Working Group (TWG), PMU and National Execution Entity, will serve their purposes and ensure timely and quality implementation. For projects of 3 year duration MTR is carried out, if required, by the Task Manager. THE PIRs of the first year and the second half yearly reports will provide the inputs for assessing if an MTR is required.

On Indicator D ? the baseline is zero, as specified in Annex A

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Comment addressed (map is included in the body part).

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Please include the map of Thailand that covers the project implementation areas.

Agency Response

February 23, 2021

Since the proposed project is decided to be focusing on preparing structures for sectoral data collection at policy level, there is no foreseeable area-based activities.

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows.

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SY, March 18, 2021: Additional comments cleared.

SY, March 17, 2021: Please address the below additional comments (responses can be provided in the relevant boxes).

1. On Proportionality of PMC: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 8.5%, for a co-financing of \$1,927,293 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$163,811 instead of \$100,000 (which is 5.19%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach the same level.
2. Budget: 125 - Operating & Othr Costs and 130 - Supplies, Commodities & Materials those related to PMCs should be charged to PMCs instead of the main Components. This will change the budget allocation slightly.
3. Gender Equality: There are some inconsistencies in terms of the information on gender in this submission. In the section on gender, the submission includes

information under headings that says (1) gender analysis and (2) gender action plan. The information provided under these headings are, however, superficial. In addition, it states that, during the initial phase of the project implementation period, the project will "conduct a gender analysis and create a Gender Action Plan" for the project. While it is positive that this work will, as stated, be developed in close consultation with the Ministry responsible for women and gender issues and relevant NGOs, the GEF policy on Gender Equality requires projects to have completed gender analysis prior to CEO endorsement/approval. As such, please request Agency to provide further clarity on the gender analysis to date and or any justifications on the delayed gender analysis

SY, Feb 27, 2021: Please address the remaining comments and resubmit shortly.

SY, Dec 8, 2020: Not at this stage. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/8/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations