



# REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM SIZE PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes			
Country(ies):	Thailand	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5512
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4839
Other Executing Partner(s):	The Office of Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) and the Zoological Parks Organisation (ZPO) both within the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (MONRE)	Submission Date:	21 August 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee (\$):	167,096
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 3. Certified production landscapes and seascapes (ha)		1,100,000	4,997,232
	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors	GEF TF	499,004	5,309,092
Sub-total				1,599,004	10,306,324
Project management cost			GEF TF	159,900	830,909
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,758,904	11,137,233

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective:</b> To mainstream globally important biodiversity species conservation into production sectors through improved management of critical habitats						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Enabling Framework and Capacity to manage	TA	<i>Enabling policy and institutional environment for mainstreaming BD through managing production landscapes resulting in:</i>	1.1 Legislative framework for ES conservation strengthened through development of an ES and Critical Habitat Bill	GEF TF	499,004	5,309,092

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

endangered species (ES) in productive landscapes		<p>No overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red List of Thailand (i.e. no movement from one category to another)</p> <p><i>Increases knowledge and skills of ONEP as the central institution responsible for endangered species (ES) and critical habitat management with a target of achieving capacity level 3 (from current position of 1) for Indicators 2, 3, and 11 of the UNDP capacity score card</i></p> <p><i>At least 33,893 ha of land legislated as endangered species (ES) Critical Habitats and managed in a manner that assures the long-term survival of Endangered Species</i></p>	<p>1.2 Land Use Planning Framework in place that integrates conservation into land-use planning and allocation decisions</p> <p>1.3 ONEP-led cross-sectoral coordination mechanism in place leading to better planning, coordination, monitoring and enforcement capabilities for endangered species (ES) conservation</p> <p>1.4 Institutional capacity of ONEP to identify endangered species (ES) and monitor its recovery strengthened</p>			
Critical habitat management demonstrated for 3 Endangered Species (ES)	TA	<p><i>Official Government gazettal of the listing of three ES namely Spoon-billed Sandpiper (SBS) (<u>Eurynorhynchus pygmeus</u> Critically endangered Red List Category), Water Lily (<u>Crinum thaianum</u> Endangered Red List Category) and Eastern Sarus Crane (ESC) (<u>Grus antigone</u>, Vulnerable Red List Category )</i></p> <p><i>Management and Recovery Plans developed and integrated into Provincial Land Use Planning Frameworks covering at least 75,951 ha for three targeted ES.</i></p> <p><i>Stability and increases in numbers of populations of the following species at target sites:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Spoon-Billed Sandpiper – no reduction in species number of 4 individuals</li> <li>– Water Lily – 10% increase in blooming areas – from current level of 0.55ha</li> <li>– ESC &gt; 25 in “wild’ population from current level of 25 and ‘wild’ breeding taking place (currently no breeding occurring).</li> </ul> <p><i>Reductions in the identified threats to the three target species to ensure that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– No increase in area of critical</li> </ul>	<p>2.1 Management and zoning plans implemented of the identified critical habitats of Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Water Lily and Eastern Sarus Crane in Burirum, Samutsakorn and Ranong Provinces.</p> <p>2.2 Long term financial sustainability strategy for 3 ES habitat sites developed</p> <p>2.3 Strengthening of Extension support to help guide land users to adopt biodiversity friendly land-use practices.</p>	GEF TF	1,100,000	4,997,232

	<p>SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Kok Kham location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Increase in survival rate of reintroduced ESC population from current level of 70% over 3 years.</li> <li>– At end-of-project, no export recorded of ‘wild’ collected water lilies at the Savarnabhumi Airport - a reduction from 669,563 Water Lilies exported through Suvarnabhumi Airport during 2006 -2009 (number of ‘wild’ collected specimens not known)<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> <p>Local communities in 7 subdistricts capacitated to adjust their economic activities resulting in more biodiversity friendly production techniques being employed covering 600 ha of salt pans and 400 ha of rice fields</p>				
Subtotal				1,599,004	10,306,324
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>			GEF TF	159,900	830,909
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,758,904	11,137,233

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Implementing Agency	UNDP	Cash	40,000
Government	ONEP – Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment	Cash	3,498,617
		In-kind	3,498,616
Government	ZPO – Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Cash	2,000,000
		In-kind	2,000,000
NGO	Thailand Wetland Foundation	Cash	90,000
		In-kind	10,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			11,137,233

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust	Focal Area	Country Name/	(in \$)
------------	---------------	------------	---------------	---------

<sup>3</sup> A report from plant quarantine officials at the Department of Agriculture in Sawannaburi Airport estimated that 669,563 Water Lilies were exported during the period 2006 – 2009.

<sup>4</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

	Fund		Global	Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Thailand	1,758,904	167,096	1,926,000
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				1,758,904	167,096	1,926,000

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

#### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	36,000	0	36,000
National/Local Consultants	116,000	0	116,000

#### G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No.

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>5</sup>

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAP: national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc

N/A

#### A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The project supports strategic objective 2 of the GEF biodiversity focal area (BD-2) – Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes, and sectors.

More specifically, the project will contribute to Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. It will do this through the development of effective management approaches for critical habitats for three endangered species directly impacting an area of 75,951ha<sup>6</sup>. Broader policy engagement and support will also help integrate biodiversity, ES and critical habitat considerations into the planning processes of at least three provinces and work on ES and critical habitat monitoring will also improve the capacity to sustainably manage critical habitat within Thailand.

The project will also contribute to Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks, through the development and adoption of a new Endangered Species and Critical Habitat Bill and a land use planning framework. Key elements of this bill and framework will also be integrated into key sector policies and programmes led by the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce and the Ministry of Interior.

<sup>5</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

<sup>6</sup> Sarus Crane: -29,443ha (area of six sub-districts excluding 2,661ha of non-hunting area)

Spoon-billed sandpiper: Khok Kham Sub-district 7000ha

Water-lily: Nakha Sub-district: 39,508ha

Total: 75,951Sub-districtSub-district

The project also advances the strategic targets of the UNCBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020, in particular, 7) By 2020, areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; and 12) By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those in decline, has been improved and sustained.

### **A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has two signature programmes on biodiversity – one of which deals with the mainstreaming of biodiversity into development sectors. This project builds on UNDP's global work on this issue as well as on the strong partnership it has with the Royal Government of Thailand and the Thai civil society in their efforts to promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the country. The present project will benefit from, as well as contribute to, UNDP's past and current work in Thailand. UNDP has been supporting projects to build national and local capacities to ensure that supply chains for various commodities are environmentally and socially responsible and that such products have secure market shares. The project also builds on UNDP's work with the private sector including policy advice and capacity building support to governments. It also helps poor producers access markets that offer realistic prospects for sustainable, employment-intensive growth and mobility to higher paying jobs, through investments in human capital and fostering the entrepreneurial skills of the poor.

Moreover, UNDP has a large global portfolio and extensive experience in supporting effective environmental governance by developing the national enabling environment, including policy, laws, capacity building and partnership development. In Thailand, UNDP has considerable experience working with local communities – particularly on land management and livelihoods – through its work on the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Funds. The interventions proposed under this project are in line with the current United Nations Partnership Frameworks of Thailand (2012 – 2016) developed jointly by resident and non-resident UN Agencies, Government of Thailand and civil society and which aims to enhance national development processes towards environmental sustainability. In terms of staffing, UNDP Thailand has sufficient staff to provide effective supervision of the project and will ensure rigorous supervision and project implementation of this project through the support of its programme unit. This team is also supported and gain addition, technical backstopping from the UNDP-Asia Regional Centre (Bangkok) during the design and implementation phases.

### **A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:**

Thailand has undergone a rapid process of development over the last three decades that has lifted large numbers of people from poverty. This development has been based on rapid processes of industrialization, urbanization, and by intensified agricultural production and fishing. In each area development has relied heavily on the country's abundant and diverse natural resources but has also resulted in degradation of land, the loss of natural habitats, and generated increasing levels of air and water pollution. By 2004 - 2005 levels of air and water pollution were significantly serious to be identified as costing the country between 1.6 and 2.6% of GDP per year<sup>7</sup>.

These challenges have presented a number of threats to the maintenance of biodiversity and the survival of endangered species. These include:

- Habitat loss and degradation
- Over exploitation of resources

**Habitat loss and degradation** has occurred and is happening as a result of combined rapid economic development and population growth resulting in an increasing demand for land for infrastructure (e.g. road and dam construction), agriculture and industry.

Thailand's agricultural sector has expanded rapidly over the past 60 years. Initial expansion focused mainly on expansion of agricultural areas by forest clearance and high levels of domestic labour, in 1970 some 70% of the population were employed in agriculture. More recent expansion as focused on increased intensification of agriculture as labour has become more costly and expansion of farmed area more difficult. Land clearing does, however, still continue with the Office of Agricultural Economics estimating that the areas of land used for agriculture increased by

---

<sup>7</sup> World Bank Thailand Environment Page – accesses 06/14 - <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/EASTASIAPACIFICEXT/EXTEAPREGTOPENVIRONMENT/0..contentMDK:20266329~menuPK:537827~pagePK:34004173~piPK:34003707~theSitePK:502886.00.html>

45,000ha per annum from 2005 to 2010. Much of this clearance occurs on forested land or through the reclamation of wetlands or other natural habitats.

Production increases have come from increases in mechanization as well as the use of improved chemical inputs and seed varieties. While this progress has made Thailand one of the world's most important exporters of agricultural products, and consistently among the top two or three rice exporters, weak regulation of the use of some chemicals has led to widespread pollution and damage to the broader agricultural environment.

Expansion of the economy has been driven by significant industrialization and the development of the infrastructure to support both it and improved access to markets by agricultural suppliers. These developments however have also required significant land areas to be converted, resulting in reductions in a range of ecosystems. Industrial development has also led to significant levels of pollution with limited regulations on levels of pollutant discharge by factories resulting in high levels of both air and water contamination.

Tourism has had a significant impact within many areas with mass tourism contributing to the clearance of coastal mangrove forests, as well as inland forest areas. The Department of National Parks (DNP) estimate that forestland cleared for other uses other than agriculture especially tourist resorts ranged from 7,386 ha in 2004 to about 2,841 ha in 2007.

The impact of these changes are also being exacerbated by changes in climate across the country resulting in longer periods of dry weather and subsequent higher intensity periods of rainfall. These conditions are putting further pressure on fragmented and vulnerable habitats particularly wetland areas, with low lying areas close to the coast also vulnerable to large storm events as well as gradual increases in salinity due to rising sea levels.

The rapid expansion and intensification of industry and agriculture has also resulted in increasing demands on and resultant, **unsustainable use of natural resources**. High demands for water within both agricultural and industrial sectors has led to significant changes in the hydrology of many areas putting significant pressure on many freshwater species, an issue that is further heightened by high levels of pollution. Such unsustainable practices are also not limited to terrestrial activities. In the fisheries sector overharvesting of fish stocks is estimated to have reduced fishing yields by 90%<sup>8</sup>. While such unsustainable practices are prohibited within protected areas there is limited protection for areas outside protected sites putting increasing pressure on species and habitats linked to productive sectors.

Hunting of wild animals and endangered species for both domestic uses and international trade (both exotic pet and traditional medicine) remains a significant challenge in Thailand despite progress in enforcing laws and regulations against it.

These threats are also being exacerbated by ongoing changes in climate that are increasing the severity and unpredictability of weather events within Thailand. Small increases in temperature have the potential to significantly impact Thailand's major rice crops with many farmers seeking to address environmental stresses through increased chemical usage. At the same time increased periods of draught followed by intensive periods of rainfall are also increasing pressure on water resources as farmers seek to increase irrigation and deforested watersheds are increasingly vulnerable to flooding.

*With regard to the Target Species:* The illegal trafficking of Eastern Sarus Crane from Cambodia through Thailand continues and can very quickly affect the reintroduced Eastern Sarus Crane population in Thailand. Further, killing of Spoon-billed Sandpipers, and possibly Eastern Sarus Crane, as by-catch can occur when hunters target other species for supply to local markets for food, especially if netting is the hunting method used, the collection of Water Lily bulbs from the wild for international trade for home aquaria and fishponds is a threat to the survival of the species. A report from plant quarantine officials at the Department of Agriculture in Suwannabumi Airport estimated that 669,563 Water Lilies were exported during the period 2006 – 2009.

### **Long-term Solution, Baseline Project and Barriers**

The long term solution lies in reforming the manner in which agricultural, forestry, aquaculture and other production activities are planned and regulated across different land units and tenure categories at the landscape scale in order to

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid

avoid, reduce and mitigate the pressures leading to ES biodiversity loss. This will be bought about through the ‘mainstreaming’ of biodiversity into existing land use planning and management approaches as well as commercial decision making and enterprise.

At the national level the project will emplace the necessary planning and enforcement framework to mainstream ES conservation in the wider landscape. At the site level, the project will demonstrate through the development of land use plans and through compliance monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans based on the needs of the ES and especially its habitat requirements the long term conservation of the three target species. Further, innovative approaches to the development of biodiversity goods and services and the integration of their production within site level management plans will provide case study examples of how biodiversity and production can be effectively linked. These lessons will not only provide valuable examples for similar locations within Thailand but will also provide insight for regional and global efforts to conserve endangered species.

The current baseline investments are described below at the national and site level as part of a business as usual scenario. Accompanying these is a description of the barriers impeding effective biodiversity management. The project is designed to remove these barriers.

## **National**

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) annually spends about US\$ 44 million (US\$ 176 million over the project period) on nature conservation activities. These investments are targeted mostly towards protected area management supporting the operation of Thailand’s extensive network of PAs, under the Protected Areas Act. Funds are also used to support the establishment of lists of reserved and protected animals, managing hunting and controlling the trade in wild animal products as set out in the Wildlife Reservation and Protection Act (1992).

This work is supported by a number of national and international NGOs working on conservation within the country as well as development partners supporting these initiatives. The majority of this work is focused on key biodiversity hotspots within the country.

### **Barriers at National Level**

There are two main barriers to achieving the long-term solution: (i) inadequate planning and enforcement framework to mainstream ES conservation in the wider landscape and (ii) inadequate demonstrated experiences in land use planning and ES-compatible land management practices.

#### *Inadequate Planning and Enforcement to mainstream ES Conservation in the Wider Landscape:*

The existing focus of conservation policy and financing has been on the establishment and management of PAs. This is especially true for endangered species where the focus has been on hotspot identification and inclusion into the PA system. For those areas outside PAs in the production landscapes, conservation of ES through mainstreaming into the policies and programmes of other line ministries and subnational authorities has been ad hoc and unsystematic.

Some avenues do exist to strengthen the conservation of biodiversity in production landscapes through use of legal designations to prevent the direct killing of species (through the Wildlife Act (1992)) or to integrate improved environmental management into conservation activities in the form of an Environmental Protection Area (under the NEQA (1992)). The first of these mechanisms however is limited in its capacity to conserve the critical habitats for ES with restrictions only focused on direct impacts on species as opposed to broader conservation of species and their habitat. Under this act area based conservation is also focused on ‘traditional’ protected areas that restrict and prevent production activities as opposed to integrating conservation within them.

The NEQA provides for a more flexible approach but has no focus on ES and has been limited in its implementation. With no current legal mandate requiring conservation of ES or Critical habitats making EPA designation for these reasons is often politically difficult with ONEP lacking the political capital to drive forward conservation measures against perceived economic development priorities. As such only one such area has been designated with success being supported by a link between the species and the Royal Family. While the NEQA also provides for the implementation of environmental safeguards in the form of EIAs the activities for which these are required and the areas in which they are required are limited and guidelines are silent on additional requirements that should be implemented should ES be identified.

As such there is currently no legal requirement to ensure the conservation of species within Thailand or the maintenance of critical habitats. While efforts do exist under the MONRE and the country's commitments to international conventions these are not effectively mainstreamed into existing legislation and there is no clear framework through which ES and critical habitat conservation is required, organised or operationalized. This has resulted in a range of ad hoc approaches, which while valuable within their own areas do not provide a sustainable or consistent approach. There is thus a need for a legal framework that:

- sets requirements for ES and critical habitat conservation;
- defines the roles and responsibilities of key government institutions in land use planning and management in ES critical habitats; and
- lays out prescriptions/ circumscriptions for land use within the ES critical habitat – such as no-go areas for development in highly sensitive areas, and biodiversity conservation-friendly development in the adjacent areas to protect corridors and sensitive habitats where development cannot be avoided.

Additionally, the various roles and responsibilities of the different government agencies for the management of critical habitats of ES (such as planning, monitoring and enforcement) remain to be clarified. Currently the various responsible government departments have overlapping mandates and often mutually exclusive objectives that amplify conflicts between development goals versus biodiversity concerns. One example of this is with regard to enforcement of existing environmental regulations, which currently falls heavily with sector ministries making the Ministry of Industry and Pollution Control Department (PCD) – under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment responsible for controlling pollution from factories or the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MoAC) responsible for enforcing controls on pollution in agriculture. While this does provide from some sector experience it also presents an internal conflict of interest within many ministries that are focusing on developing output or production, with the regulatory capacity of ONEP limited only to setting of guidance and limits with no enforcement powers. This speaks to the need for an effective inter-sectoral coordination mechanism and means to integrate biodiversity conservation principles into development plans and production sector practices to reduce pressures on biodiversity, while also strengthening the enforcement capacity and mandate of key agencies.

Planning, monitoring and enforcement efforts are in any case also undermined by the absence of an effective decision-making support system fed by biodiversity status assessments and environmental impact assessments (to assess and direct development away from critical habitat and also to identify effective protection measures for ES). Within ONEP there is currently a lack of technical expertise in conducting landuse planning utilising multiple variables (economic social and environmental) and limited skills in utilising GIS support tools. The organisation also lacks expertise to develop recovery plans for ES, which are able to be mainstreamed into the work of line agencies. There is therefore a need to: establish a central database on ES, capacitate ONEP in the development of recovery plans for ES, emplace a monitoring system within ONEP to evaluate acceptable levels of change in defined critical habitats, and to take adaptive measures to reduce impacts. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) are only mandatory for newly designed, large-scale production-type projects<sup>9</sup>, but not mandatory for land-based activities already underway. Providing a mechanism to increase the use of EIAs and Initial Environmental Evaluations<sup>10</sup> (IEEs) at the site level as well as Strategic Environmental and Social Impact Assessments at the planning (provincial and local) and policy development level that includes consideration of ES would significantly strengthen the protection of ES and critical habitats.

#### *Inadequate existing experience in integrating land-use planning and ES compatible land management.*

---

<sup>9</sup> EIAs are only required in Thailand for the following type of projects and activities (depending on size): dam and reservoir construction, irrigation, commercial airport, hotel and resort development, mass transit system and expressways, mining, industrial estates, commercial ports and harbors, thermal power plants, coastal reclamation, highway or road development, building in areas adjacent to rivers, lakes or beaches or in the vicinity of National Parks and specific industrial projects, namely petrochemical, oil, refinery, natural gas separation or processing, chloralkaline, iron and steel, pulp industry, pesticide industry or industry producing active ingredient by chemical process, chemical fertilizer industry using chemical process in production. Projects within Environmentally Protected Areas (EPA) require an EIA depending on the conditions and notifications defined for each EPA. Certain defined projects in Forest Conservation Areas require EIA report. ONEP, 2012. Environmental Impact Assessment in Thailand.

<sup>10</sup> A 'light touch' form of EIA suitable for smaller developments or changes in landuse.



With the background of high relative poverty levels, provincial, district and sub-district public authorities are guided by the quick-gain philosophy with respect to agriculture and aquaculture practices. The same applies to infrastructural development. While theoretical options for long-term sustainable use of the land and water are available, ensuring the conservation of biodiversity and important ecosystem services, their conservation, efficacy and benefits have not been tested.

Sites that are considered to be globally and nationally important for biodiversity may be considered important by local communities and local government for different (economic) reasons. The trade-off between conservation and local use may not be considered fair by local communities if conservation leads to sub-optimal livelihood options for them. However, currently there are limited capacities locally to assess such trade-offs and develop a negotiated solution to maximize local to global benefits.

There is also a clear lack of knowledge among the tourism sector, the private sector and land owners regarding the benefits of biodiversity-friendly tourism and other conservation-friendly development strategies, as well as the application of legal tools and incentives to adopt sustainable sector practices while maintaining or increasing household income amongst local communities.

The most important barrier to operationalizing the management of critical habitats of ES at the site level is the lack of know-how and limited examples within the country of applying land use planning and regulatory frameworks to manage development across different sectors to secure positive biodiversity outcomes. Numerous land use maps have been produced by the mapping centers of the Land Development Department (LDD), but the actual implementation of these plans has been disappointing. Although some maps of biodiversity priority areas exist, they are not reflected in the District and Provincial Development Plans.

Further, Thailand does not have operational “on-the-ground” examples of technical interventions that sustainably promote long-term biodiversity conservation of specific ES in the production landscapes outside the protected areas. Without access to replicable demonstrations, government decision-makers and resource users do not have the tools and knowledge necessary to decrease biodiversity loss. Where maximizing global benefits requires a loss of or reduction in local benefits, then means of compensation or substitution schemes need to be developed.

### **Species Specific:**

#### ***Water Lily:***

Efforts to conserve the Water Lily have been developing over recent years and it is expected that US\$ 3.5 million will be invested in Water Lily Conservation and related activities over the next four years.

The Ranong Natural Resources and Environment Provincial Office has established a Water Lily nursery and will invest an estimated US\$ 200,000 in its operation. Also, the Thailand Research Fund supports Klong Nakha conservation activities and also started a Water Lily propagation programme with US\$ 200,000 anticipated to be invested during the project period. The Ranong Provincial Agriculture Office will support the operations of the Sufficient Agricultural Learning Center and the Klong Nakha Traditional Herbs Group with an estimated budget of US\$ 1.5 million. These initiatives are relevant to the project as they provide vehicles for advocating more biodiversity-friendly practices in the agricultural field in order to reduce erosion. The Tourism Authority of Thailand also promotes nature-based tourism and runs tourism campaigns. Most nature-based tourism enterprises are community-based with a focus on environmentally-friendly activities. The Community-based tourism enterprises in the Klong Nakha area have collaborated to form a tourism network called “North Andaman Community Tourism Network” (N-ACT), which includes 11 groups. Various organisations e.g. Mangroves for the Future (MFF) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) assist this network with enterprise development.

#### ***Water Lily Barriers:***

Despite these initiatives a number of barriers remain to effective conservation of the species including:

- *A lack of legal protection for the Water lily or the area in which it exists.* The critical habitat for the Water Lily currently has not formal designation and as such there are no formal, or legal powers to stop development or any other form of “take”.
- *A lack of awareness of and knowledge within key institutions, which are responsible for resource management in the area.* Local government officials, decisions makers and those responsible for land management have limited awareness of the impact of different policies, programmes or activities on the status of the water lily. Excess use of fertilisers by farmers or land conversion from natural forest to plantation is not readily identified as destroying the habitat of the lily while efforts to prevent flooding are not undertaken with consideration of potential environmental impacts or alternative approaches.
- *Lack of government leadership within key ministries.* Due to limited awareness there is a lack of leadership at the Provincial level to help strengthen the protection status of the water lily. This reduces the long term sustainability of local conservation actions and leaves the area vulnerable to changes in policy or development plans at provincial level.
- *Value of economic crops over natural forest.* The potential value of existing land areas within the river catchments that contain the water lily compared to existing income from tourism or other activities presents a barrier to fully halting conversion on a voluntary basis.
- *High value of water lily bulbs.* Water lily bulbs fetch a high price on the international market. The potential economic gains available to community members from harvesting these bulbs thus presents a barrier to effectively preventing harvesting of the water lily.

### ***Spoon-billed Sandpiper:***

There are a number of activities underway to support the conservation of the SBS within Khok Kham sub-district, which cut across national government, local government and civil society groups.

Efforts have been made by these groups to increase awareness of the value of the species as well as the broader water bird habitat through the organization of awareness raising events including events for international bird day for which the Khok Kham Tambon Administration Organization has held, and plans to continue to hold, the “Khok Kham Bird Festival” on an annual basis. An event that has a budget of US\$100,000. The Khok Kham Conservation Club (KKCC) also works on increasing awareness of local habitats and endangered species through events and community engagement as well as patrolling and monitoring of illegal activities and will invest a further US\$ 50,000 in the area during the project period.

The Kasetsart University has an educational programme targeting the Spoon-billed Sandpiper with students engaging with the local community and undertaking baseline research. It is estimated that their investment in Spoon-billed Sandpiper conservation actions over the next four years will be US\$ 40,000. The Department of National Parks (DNP) as well as the Bird Conservation Society of Thailand (BCST) maintain shorebird databases and conduct regular surveys at key bird areas. An estimated amount of US\$ 40,000 will be allocated for these surveys over the project period targeting the Khok Kham sub-district specifically.

In October 2013, BCST and the Department of Marine and Coastal Resources (DMCR) co-organized a workshop for the Spoonbill Conservation Plan 2013-2016. The plan is a continuation of the previous phase of 2010-2013. Attendees include ONEP, DNP and Provincial Office of Natural Resources and the Environment (PONRE) of Samutsakorn. As part of the process a grant of 5.6 million baht (USD 175,000) was assigned to the BCST for the three year implementation of the plan. The Thai Wetlands Foundation have also worked closely with the BCST in undertaking conservation activities within the area and plan to continue to do so.

### ***Spoon-billed Sandpiper Barriers:***

Despite these efforts there are a number of critical barriers to developing effective conservation efforts within the area. These include:

- *Lack of coherent coastal zone management programme* – coastal erosion within the Gulf of Thailand has become a significant problem and a number of approaches to addressing this have been adopted. Within Khok Kham efforts have been made to protect the coastal area through the use of bamboo pole sediment traps combined with mangrove

replanting. While this approach is demonstrating some success a lack of an integrated planning between sites within the Gulf leave individual schemes vulnerable to changes in sediment flows from activities along the coastline. Improved coordination between provinces and districts in planning coastal management would help to address this something that could be facilitated by both improved coordination between government agencies and the undertaking of effective Strategic Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (SEIAs) for policies and programmes that are likely to impact coastal areas.

- *Lack of integrated conservation planning* – the Samut Songkram province has a broad range of economic activities and competing land-uses. Existing Provincial plans are developed based on line ministry objectives and integrated planning for conservation objectives is limited even in areas of recognized conservation value.
- *Lack of knowledge on the optimum management regimes for Spoon-billed Sandpiper in salt and mud flat areas* – limited knowledge exists on how to optimize the integration of existing land management and economic activities such as salt production with species conservation. Some information exists on the requirements of the SBS in particular for low disturbance approaches to salt production but further assessment of water levels and in-salt plan ecology would provide a clearer basis of how to maximize the opportunities for combined production and conservation. This information would then need to be shared with local communities and farmers.
- *Lack of local revenue capture related to tourism* – the most significant economic benefit currently derived from the presence of the SBS as well as other water birds comes from tourism. Limited local infrastructure or capacity combined with a Bangkok centered market for bird watching however currently limits revenue capture from this activity at local level. Indeed increasing tourist numbers if not effectively managed threaten to disrupt local livelihoods rather than strengthen them. As such farmers and communities see limited economic value in the presence of the species and thus have limited economic incentives for its conservation.
- *Fluctuating and low salt prices* – the salt price within Thailand has fluctuated significantly within the past decade and is now at a low of approximately 3-5 Bhat (8-9 US cents) per kilo a price that makes seasonal (salt pans can only be used in the dry season) salt farming a very marginal livelihood.

#### ***Eastern Sarus Crane:***

The Eastern Sarus Crane (ESC) reintroduction programme has seen significant progress and key local and national institutions remain committed to its success. The authorities responsible for the management of the three non-hunting areas (Huay Chorakaemak Reservoir, Huay Talat Reservoir and Sanambin Reservoir) in Buriram Province will invest US\$ 400,000 over the project period.

The Buriram Provincial Natural Resource and Environment Office (PONRE) will invest an estimated US\$ 5 million during the project for training of local natural resources and environment management volunteers. The Tambon Administrative Office (TAO) will be carrying out awareness raising in the communities, with an estimated investment of US\$ 50,000 over the project period. The Ministry of Tourism and Sport (MoTS) will invest US\$10 million in the Buriram Province to develop wildlife-based tourism infrastructure. The Korat Zoo will continue its research on the reintroduction of the ESC, with an estimated investment of US\$ 50,000 over the next four years. The Buriram Provincial Irrigation Office (PIO) will invest approximately US\$ 6 million in management of reservoir areas, largely targeting the improvement of the landscape around the reservoir to increase water capture, including through reforestation.

#### ***Eastern Sarus Crane Barriers:***

Despite these efforts there are a number of significant barriers to effective conservation of the species within the area including:

- *Lack of legal protection* – while the non-hunting areas are under protection the surrounding habitat has limited management requirements although large-scale industrial developments are restricted within a buffer area around the non-hunting area. As such there are no legal requirements to ensure that surrounding farmland is managed in a manner conducive to maintaining the habitat of the non-hunting area. This situation also results in a challenging context for effective coordination and planning related to the sites as a significant number of agencies have jurisdiction over the land area with PONRE and the DNP having limited capacity to enforce any conservation or protection activities (see also below).
- *Demand for water* – agriculture within the area remains a significant livelihood for many with farmers within the irrigation areas seeking to increase or maintain their harvest levels. This puts an ongoing stress on management

decisions related to the reservoirs and restricts the potential management of water levels to maximize benefits for the ESC and other bird species.

- *Limited awareness* – there remains limited awareness at the local and provincial level of the reintroduction of the ESC, its habitat requirements and its potential value as a tourist symbol / provincial icon. At the local level this has resulted in inappropriate local land use management practices as well as some farmers being concerned about the impact of the cranes on their crops. At the provincial level this has prevented pro-active efforts to conserve and effectively manage critical habitats.
- *Lack of economic benefits and revenue capture* – local communities and the non-hunting areas do not currently derive any significant economic benefit from the presence of the species or indeed the relatively high visitor numbers to the non-hunting areas. This provides limited incentive for the conservation of the habitat by community decision makers’ objectives and also acts as a missed opportunity for the non-hunting areas to be able to strengthen their implementation programmes.

The project is designed by closely complying with the objectives, outcomes, components, GEF budget and co-financing specified in the PIF. There has been no change in the GEF budget total or the allocation of budgets across outcomes. The co-financing targets in the PIF have been met.

The overwhelming majority of quantitative targets from the PIF have been maintained with the following minor changes occurring.

**Table 1. Changes made, compared to information provided in original Project Identification Form (PIF)**

Area of change	Original PIF	Final CEO Endorsement Request	Reasons for change
Outcome Indicators – Component 2	<i>Critical Habitats defined for the three ES and management and recovery plans developed and integrated into Provincial Land Use Planning Frameworks measured by no net loss of critical habitat.</i>	Management and Recovery Plans developed and integrated into Provincial Land Use covering at least 75,951 ha for three targeted ES.	Protection measures will be developed based on existing administrative jurisdictions as such the hectare areas designated will related to administrative boundaries within which critical habitats exist. This will allowed for conservation activities to be more effectively mainstreamed into existing institutional structures as well as ensuring broader protection measures that limit indirect as well as direct impacts on critical habitats. The actual designation of the critical habitats of the three ES are covered under the following outcome under Component 1: <i>At least 33,893 ha of land legislated as endangered species (ES) Critical Habitats and managed in a manner that assures the long-term survival of Endangered Species</i>

**A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:**

In the **baseline scenario**, at national level the MONRE will continue to work on developing approaches to biodiversity conservation focused on area based conservation activities. ONEP will work to support coordination of activities related to ES and critical habitat conservation but with a limited tool set and national capacity will only be able to make limited progress in the protection and conservation of a few high profile target species. At the same time Thailand’s growing population and economy will continue to put increasing pressure on natural resources resulting in further degradation of critical habitats, and fragmentation of key habitat areas. Land use management and planning processes will also remain contested with PONRE offices having limited tools or capacity to challenge development decisions on the basis of biodiversity conservation. Efforts to develop environmentally friendly goods and services will also continue but will focus on high profile target areas or species located in or surrounding protected areas with the broader potential of this approach within other production landscapes not being fully realised.

Scenarios for site level situations are provided below.

The **GEF alternative** at national level will be to have ES and critical habitat conservation and biodiversity friendly practices mainstreamed into land use planning and management practices in different sectors. It will do this by developing both the institutional tools and the institutional capacity to support mainstreaming. It will work closely with the ONEP and ZPO in developing legislation, regulations and planning frameworks than enable mainstreaming and support these institutions in developing effective monitoring systems for ES and critical habitats that can then be used to effectively assess the status of ES and critical habitats and feedback into land use decision making processes. The project will also support ONEP to strengthen existing coordination mechanisms for land use planning and management to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of how ES, critical habitats and biodiversity more broadly are integrated into these processes. This support will help deliver more effective land use decision-making processes that take into account the importance of biodiversity, ES and critical habitats.

The project will also work across the three pilot sites and at national level to help catalyse a paradigm shift within production sector to focus more on environmental standards within production techniques. Through development of three clear pilot projects that develop environmentally friendly goods and services the project will provide a base for further advocacy and awareness raising of the value of these approaches. Through working with project partners including government offices such as the BEDO, civil society groups and networks such as the N-ACT and the private sector the project will help share these lessons and develop best practice within their development that can be promoted within sector ministries to support improved extension support to farmers, budget allocations and policy reforms.

The implementation of the proposed project will have an immediate global environmental benefit through improved land use planning and management approaches that take into account the importance of ES and critical habitats and the development of conservation and recovery plans to support the future of these species. This will lead to strengthened conservation for ES and critical habitats within Thailand and the recovery of currently endangered species and their associated habitats, something that will have broader environmental and social benefits through habitat conservation and improvements in environmental quality.

As a result of the significant effort that the project will make on institutional capacity building and the mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations into tourism sector development, these benefits will be sustainable.

Further information on the GEF alternative at site level is provided in the table below.

ES and Critical Habitat	Current Situation	GEF Alternative
Spoon-billed Sandpiper (Khok Kham Sub-district)	The critical habitat for Spoon-billed Sandpiper’s survival in Khok Kham Sub-district is known but not effectively mapped nor zoned as per critical importance to the ES. No powers to stop any form of development or “take” of ES currently exist. NGOs will continue to work with the local administration to	The critical habitat for Spoon-billed Sandpiper’s survival in Khok Kham Sub-district are identified, mapped and zoned. All forms of development will be located outside of core areas. Extension packages are developed to encourage mass adoption of sustainable practices in salt production and aquaculture. Increased

	support some conservation efforts. An increasing trend to change from traditional salt-pans towards intensive managed, modern, deep and steep-sided aquaculture ponds, typically unsuitable for shorebirds is likely to continue however resulting in decline in habitat area and further declines in numbers of the species within Thailand.	community incomes and improved lives as a result of profits from certified, biodiversity friendly enterprises such as salt products and eco-tourism. Protection is supported at provincial and national level by strengthened land use planning frameworks for ES and critical habitats.
Water Lily (Nakha Sub-district)	<p>The critical habitat for Water Lily’s survival in Nakha Sub-district have undergone initial mapping but no management or zoning activities have been developed. Efforts to develop and promote eco-tourism will continue through the N-ATN but will be vulnerable to ongoing threats from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Indiscriminate dredging of rivers and streams for removal of sediment and rock for construction and land reclamation purposes.</li> <li>– Agriculture: Clearing of land for agriculture and resultant land-based erosion and river bank erosion, mainly for monocultures (Rubber and Palm Oil).</li> <li>– Unsustainable land use practices by local communities leading to increased pressures on land and aquatic resources resulting in resource degradation. The limited incomes of communities will also hinder further development of viable biodiversity-friendly business ventures.</li> </ul>	<p>The critical habitat for Water Lily’s survival in the Nakha Sub-district are identified, mapped and zoned. All forms of development will be located outside of core areas. Collection of Water Lilies will be prohibited in these areas.</p> <p>Zoning will include areas in which dredging will be permitted as it will not have a negative effect on water lily populations and will have local economic gains. Specific methods to minimize impact will be prescribed in certain areas e.g. trapping of sediment.</p> <p>Strengthened management of forest fragments will help to improve the quality of water run off and watershed management. Regulated pesticide use will be implemented in areas identified as having an effect on Water Lily population with farmers and agricultural extension workers fully aware of values of biodiversity with some shifting their marketing strategy to focus on sustainable production. Extension package encourage mass adoption of sustainable practices in agriculture. Increased community incomes and improved lives as a result of profits from certified, biodiversity friendly enterprises such as NTFP products and eco-tourism.</p>
Eastern Sarus Crane (Ban Bua, Samet, Sakae Prong, Sakae Sum and Prakhon Chai Sub-districts)	<p>The critical habitat for Eastern Sarus Crane in Ban Bua, Samet, Sakae Prong, Sakae Sum and Prakhon Chai Sub-districts is known with initial mapping undertaken based on movements of released birds. Limited powers exist to address “take” of ES outside of non-hunting areas.</p> <p>ES reintroduction to continue but remain vulnerable to poisoning from agricultural chemicals and habitat degradation. Expanding agriculture and ongoing infrastructure development (resulting from increased population and housing) will have an increased demand for water, resulting in further degradation of habitats and increased pressure on rehabilitation process.</p>	<p>The critical habitat for Eastern Sarus Crane in Ban Bua, Samet, Sakae Prong, Sakae Sum and Prakhon Chai Sub-districts are fully identified, mapped and zoned. All forms of development will be located outside of core areas.</p> <p>Extension package encourage mass adoption of sustainable practices in agriculture. Increased community incomes and improved lives as a result of profits from certified, biodiversity friendly enterprises such as rice products and eco-tourism. Reservoir water planning, abstraction and management incorporates ES aspects. Reservoir management benefit from increased ecotourism revenues as a result of increased tourism to view Sarus Crane and other birds.</p>

**A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:**

The project strategy is based on the assumption that by mainstreaming ES and critical habitat conservation into planning and monitoring of land use and that by providing clear indicators of how biodiversity and economic productivity can be combined within approaches to land management more stakeholders will take up such approaches. Mainstreaming requires the following ingredients –

- Effective policy and procedural framework
- Capacity to implement and manage the process

- Awareness, sensitivity, understanding.

In addition, it has been assumed that increased capacity in ONEP will facilitate the mainstreaming of biodiversity and that communities who are informed of the value of biodiversity good and services, and provided with the skills to develop them with chose to pursue these approaches.

These assumptions have given rise to the project design which sets about putting in place the guiding framework for the conservation of endangered species within production landscapes and provides how the integration of conservation activities and the production of environmentally goods and services can lead to strengthened livelihoods. The risk that these basic assumptions will fail is very low. However, there are other less fundamental risks, some of which were identified in the PIF and these are considered as follows:

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
<b>The political situation in Thailand becomes unstable</b> preventing the development of any new policies or legislation and their mainstreaming.	Moderate	Low	The current political situation is abnormal within Thailand, although plans are in place to facilitate the return of a democratic establishment. The project will work to mitigate the uncertainty by developing effective advocacy strategies to engage key decision makers with regard to bill development and formation of land use planning framework. As such the approval of such documents should be possible within the NEB and other key bodies. The project will also work to operationalize these approaches at the site level. Should full approval of them thus be impossible the project will still be able to work with local partners to develop these site level interventions that will can form the basis of future policy and legislative development.
<b>Weak coordination and cooperation between different government agencies</b> will be difficult at the sites	Moderate	Moderate	A number of government agencies working on water resources, agriculture, and local development will need to be involved in achieving coordinated management planning at the sites, which can be time-consuming. However, there is a recent move in Thailand to ensure strong local ownership over local development planning and the local Tambon officials and locally elected leaders are empowered to take on leadership roles to ensure strong coordination between line agencies.
<b>Delayed approval of ES legislation</b>	Moderate	Low	The current political environment in Thailand makes the passing of any new legislation challenging. In order to support the approval of new legislation and frameworks the project will employ a highly consultative approach drawing on reviews and inputs from various stakeholders (government, private sector, communities, local bodies and academicians) to ensure feasibility and acceptability of the proposed legal document. The proposed cross-sectoral institutional mechanism will become the vehicle for optimizing dialogue among stakeholders and support towards the enactment of the legislation. Further, the project is led by the government agency responsible for setting up environmental policies and legislation in Thailand; the local ownership of the project is high. The Government of Thailand has initiated the reform of numerous environmental policies. Inevitably, the integration of ES into production sectors will be difficult unless there is clear political understanding of the need for these changes, and a full commitment to making this happen. To some extent this understanding and commitment have already been built at Government-level. This will be further strengthened in making the economic case for biodiversity conservation and showcasing its value in the three targeted areas. In order to further mitigate this risk, UNDP will maintain a watching brief over commitment and work with national and local authorities to expedite legal reforms.
<b>Weak coordination within and between local and national</b>	Moderate	Moderate	The project will support and facilitate activities to ensure improved institutional coordination, capacity building and awareness-raising at the national, provincial and district levels. The project's output "Office of Natural Resources and

<b>government and other stakeholder institutions</b> responsible for land management; limited capacity (especially at lower levels) to interact with land users on land/water management			Environmental Policy and Planning led effective coordination mechanism in place” will address this risk through emplacing a multi-stakeholder coordination framework.
<b>ES-friendly land management does not lead to sufficient economic gains</b> for households at the project sites	Moderate	Low	Only practices identified by local communities themselves as socio-economically sustainable will be disseminated for adoption on a broader scale. The project will further reduce this risk by encouraging ES-friendly land management practices and by rapidly building the capacity of communities to increase income through business development skills and marketing. The project design phase has already identified a number of options for increased income for communities through ecotourism and marketing of ES-friendly products, as outlined under Outcome 2 of the project.
<b>Migratory species are impacted by threats external to Thailand.</b>	Low	Moderate	The Spoon-billed Sandpiper migrates over vast distances and spends considerable periods of the year outside of Thailand as do a range of other migratory bird species. During these times they are vulnerable to a range of threats that are beyond the scope of the project. The project will work to mitigate the impact of any external changes in population level. First by ensuring that the domestic environment is as favourable as possible for the species to ensure that they are able to recover from annual stresses when in Thailand. Second the project will work to provide a holistic approach to critical habitat conservation and development of environmentally friendly goods and services within each location to ensure that changes in population levels of one species do not completely change peoples’ perceptions of the value of different habitats or their capacity to implement and benefit from environmental friendly goods and services.
Changes in climate adversely impact target species.	Low	Moderate	Changes in climate within Thailand have the potential to put additional pressure on the habitats of each targets species, from changes in river channel ecology for the water lily, to increases in inundation of salt pans within the SBS habitat or increased pressure on water resources within the reservoirs linked to the ESC habitat. In developing appropriate management and enforcement strategies for these areas however the project will help to reduce the impacts of any changes in climate by both reducing direct impacts (for example by strengthening regulation of water level in the reservoirs related to the ESC habitat), as well as improving the overall resilience of the habitats in which these species live by reducing ongoing disturbances within them.

Further consideration of risks will be carried out by the project during the Inception Phase.

#### **A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives**

An outline of how the project will coordinate with other related initiatives in the region is presented below.

##### ***Collaborations with other related initiatives***



INITIATIVES / INTERVENTIONS	HOW COLLABORATION WITH THE PROJECT WILL BE ENSURED
<p><i>“Integrated Community-based Forest and Catchment Management through an Ecosystem Service Approach (CBFCM)”</i></p> <p>This UNDP/GEF project is creating an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up integrated CBFCM practices in Thailand. This is being done through: (i) strengthening systemic capacities in sustainable forest and catchment management at the local, regional and national levels, and (ii) the expansion of CBFCM coverage throughout the country through pilot testing of defined PES and bio carbon financing mechanisms and up-scaling of best practices.</p>	<p>This project is closely linked to Component 2 of the proposed project in regards to encourage local management and benefits from the natural resource management. All three pilot areas are impacted by catchment management with the water lily site in particular able to learn from this project by drawing on lessons learned and potential to visit pilot areas.</p>
<p><i>“Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand’s protected Area System”</i></p> <p>This UNDP/GEF project aims to overcome barriers to sustainability of Thailand’s PA system through: (i) improving the governance in order to support an enabling environment for long-term PA system sustainability; (ii) enhancing institutional and individual capacities; (iii) assessing and testing revenue generation mechanisms and management approaches at 5 demonstration sites leading to increased funding levels of the PA system; and (iv) emplacing new models of PA management that support effective management of the System.</p>	<p>The project focuses on Protected Area Management where the proposed project will focus on mainstreaming biodiversity in productive and development sectors outside PAs, thereby complementing each other in the overall conservation of biodiversity in Thailand.</p>
<p><i>“Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand’s Production Landscapes”</i></p> <p>This UNDP/GEF project’s objective is designed to strengthen national and local capacity for mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of ecologically important production landscapes by transforming the supply and market chain of biodiversity-based products. The project will be building national capacity for support of Biodiversity Business through: (i) Improved institutional capacity and staff competences of BEDO (Biodiversity-based Economy development Office) as Thailand’s Biodiversity Business Facility for facilitation and support of community-based social enterprises; and (ii) Improved national cooperation and coordination, among partners with competencies related to biodiversity business. The proposed project will focus on land-use planning and the implementation of restrictions (communities compensated in the event that subsistence livelihoods are negatively influenced) adding an important component to the range of mainstreaming tools available in Thailand.</p>	<p>There will be strong linkages between these projects both under Component 1 with relation to identify how best new policies and frameworks can support biodiversity management within production landscapes and under component 2 in terms of operationalizing biodiversity friendly goods and services that can help conserve critical habitats.</p>

**B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

**B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation**

Stakeholders	
<b>MONRE</b>	
<p><b>Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP)</b></p>	<p>The ONEP will be the key Implementing Partner of this project through its Biodiversity Coordination Office. As the secretariat of National Environment Board (NEB), ONEP can institutionalize policy and legal frameworks for ES and habitats via NEB resolution (the NEB is chaired by the Prime Minister). As the national focal points of RAMSAR, UNFCCC, and CBD in particular, ONEP also has obligations to submit national reports on the status of ES and critical habitats and other environmental changes. With a mandate for cross-sectoral coordination, ONEP will take a lead in establishing and strengthening mechanisms for better planning, coordination, monitoring and enforcement with regard to biodiversity mainstreaming into the productive sectors. It will also be responsible for developing and ensuring enactment of the Endangered Species and Habitat Act and the hosting of the GIS-based decision support system. In developing Recovery Plans for the targeted ES, ONEP will be responsible for participatory planning with national and local administration.</p>

<b>Provincial Office of Natural Resources and Environment (PONRE)</b>	<p>PONRE is a Clearing House of all agencies under MONRE in a provincial landscape. Its role as a liaison and lobbyist to the governor will succeed the mainstreaming of Environmental agenda in all sectoral plans. In each of the three provinces, PONRE will oversee the pilot-based activities and will be closely involved in the development and enforcement of management and zoning plans (of which the governor and chief of local administrations are authorized to enforce the regulations) for the critical habitats of Spoon-billed Sandpipers, Water Lily and Eastern Sarus Crane in these three provinces. It will play an important role in reaching out to local communities in coordination with the Irrigation Department and forest administrations. To mainstream BD policy and proven results of the demo sites into the Provincial development Plan, PONRE will be the key agency to liaise with Provincial Development Committee in the planning and budgeting process.</p>
<b>Zoological Park Organisation (ZPO)</b>	<p>The ZPO has led work on the reintroduction of several globally threatened species back into the wild – including the Sarus Crane. Being a member of International Flyways Initiative, and with technical experience of ES conservation and recovery planning, ZPO brings considerable technical capacity with regard to ES conservation, as well as linkages with international experts and networks. As a government enterprise, ZPO can make profits and can accommodate a range of creative collaborations through public-private partnerships. The zoo also has experience of developing and implementing environmental education for children and adults. The ZPO role is crucial in the reproduction of critical species and knowledge dissemination for decision makers and the public awareness. For this project, the ZPO will also be able to bring its research experience from the center of reintroduction of Endangered Species (ESC in this case) providing scientific evidence of Business as Usual (BAU) and MRV (Measurable, Reportable, Verifiable) results of post project intervention. ZPO will pioneer the model of establishing monitoring system and decision-supported data and analysis for pilot ES, aiming at policy advocacy for ES legislation and public awareness on ES valuation.</p>
<b>Department of National Parks, Plants, and Wildlife Conservation (DNP)</b>	<p>The DNP is the responsible authority for Protected Areas management and is the enforcement body under the Wildlife Conservation Act, which includes a list of threatened species. However, DNP enforcement authority is focused within protected areas and the organisation has limited capacity or mandate to undertake activities within the wider production landscapes. The DNP manages the non-hunting areas in Buriram Wetlands and will be involved in the implementation of the conservation plans for the ES. It is noted that DNP has established a bureau named Protected Areas Innovation adopting PES as creative measures for ecosystem services, species and habitats conservation and are also interested in sustainable financing mechanisms for conservation.</p>
<b>Department of Marine and Coastal Resources (DMCR)</b>	<p>The DMCR's mandate is marine and coastal resources protection in areas, which are not in-land protected areas. They have experience of working on the protection and conservation of marine endangered species as well as working on integrated coastal zone management to conserve key marine and coastal habitats. The DMCR will collaborate in the project implementation at the site level, specifically at Khok Kham Sub-district, with the coastal areas (non Protected Areas) of Samut sakorn estuaries fall under DMCR supervision. The department will also be able to provide technical input on approaches to ES conservation and planning.</p>
<b>Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce (MoAC)</b>	
<b>Royal Irrigation Department (RID)</b>	<p>The RID is usually part of threats to wetland biodiversity due to focus on water extraction for agriculture. The department, however, also has the potential to be a key gatekeeper of wetland areas. For the conservation of the Eastern Sarus Crane, the Irrigation Office in Buriram is a key stakeholder actively involved in balancing water use within the three reservoirs for agriculture, domestic use and habitat conservation.</p>
<b>Department of Agriculture</b>	<p>The DOA is the research and development element of the MoAC. The Department has developed a number of certification system for agricultural products with varieties of criteria such as Good Agricultural Product, organic produce etc.</p>
<b>Cross Sectoral Committees</b>	

<b>National Environment Board (NEB)</b>	The NEB is the highest body for environmental legislation and policy supervision within the country. Chaired by the Prime Minister, the approval of the board is a significant element in ensuring the enactment of environmental legislation, implementation of policies plans and programmes. The NEB can also issue Ministerial Regulations which provide a strong mandate for activities and programmes to be undertaken and requires for all line agencies and provincial authorities to conform.
<b>National Economics and Social Development Board (NESDB)</b>	The NESDB is designated to formulate the five-year National Economic and Social Development Plan. The current 11th Development Plan emphasizes Creative Economy, Green Growth, Biodiversity, and low carbon society. As the government think tank, NESDB provides overarching direction to line ministries on integrated development schemes. The NESDB sets priorities and screens government investment projects for the Budget Bureau to allocate budget to line ministries. The NESDB guidance will legitimate provincial zoning in favour of ES conservation and recovery.
<b>Ministry of Interior</b>	
The MoI has the mandate of activating decentralization policy through designated provincial Governors who work as the head of provincial branch offices of all ministries, and also local government administration. In addition, it sets the guiding framework on integrated planning through the use of Key performance Indicators (KPIs) for all provincial administrations. The MoI will be engaged in the project through integration of ES and critical habitat related KPIs into Provincial performance monitoring systems as well as being engaged in the mainstreaming process for the land use planning framework.	
<b>Provincial Governors</b>	The provincial Governor is the commander of all central line agencies at the provincial level. Provinces have two main channels of budgeting (through line agencies, and through a direct Provincial fund) with the provincial development plan providing an integrated structure through which these different channels are linked. The Provincial governor is the chair of the provincial development committee responsible for developing and providing oversight to the plan. Line ministry budgets should be in line with this plan (and contribute to it) with allocations then being provided based on the ministerial policy and approved provincial development plan. The provincial governor is also the chairman of several sub committees for sectoral policy and implementation namely, sub committee on provincial zoning and land use planning and is also chair of the Environment Protection Area (EPA) Committees where they have been designated. The project will actively engage with Provincial governors (their offices and the provincial development committees) to support central coordination of action on ES and Critical habitats as well as ensuring a clear mandate and political support for enforcement of ES and critical habitat conservation measures.
<b>Tambon Administrative Offices (TAOs)/ Provincial Administrative Offices (PAOs)</b>	Local government is the primary administration through which national policy can be spelt out and act as primary financial support to local initiatives. Decentralization policy made drastic change to local governments allowing them to develop their own agendas and have an authorized budget. Local Government Organization will be key project champions due to their mandate for sustainable resource management generated by the decentralization policy, and their capacity and mandate to enforce national, provincial and local regulations. TAOs in the demonstration areas will be target partner for conservation planning, capacity building, local collaboration and partnership. The local government units (TAOs) are responsible for local sustainable development, so they will be involved in the process of land use planning; and oversee and allocate budgets that communities may access for livelihood projects and other development work, as well as enforcing local level regulations and Provincial level land use plans. Provincial Administration Organization (PAO) are the parallel elected body to the governor's office. Substantial budget goes to construction projects without environment mainstreaming. Either as target of change or champion for ground support, PAO will be an important project partner at provincial level.
<b>Department of Town &amp; Country Planning (DTCP)</b>	The DTCP is responsible for ongoing process of regional and urban planning and development. The DTCP will work closely with the project to help mainstreaming ES habitat zoning as guiding principle of National Land Use Planning Framework. The guiding framework will be stipulated to the development of provincial zoning and land use plans headed by the governor. The provincial branch of the DTCP and PONRE will work together in integrating the ES zoning and conservation planning into the provincial development plan that spell out relevant and effective land use and zoning and ensure corresponding budget allocations.

<b>Other Government Bodies</b>	
<b>Tourism Authority Thailand (TAT)</b>	The TAT has been supporting efforts to promote the "unseen" nature assets and wildlife-based eco-tourism. The TAT can help to provide technical guidance to the project on eco-tourism development as well as provide valuable market linkages helping local level tourism operators to access national and international markets.
<b>Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA)</b>	The DASTA govern the designated tourism areas in particular for eco-tourism and sustainable development. It works in a broad range of special areas that can include ES habitats and promoting ES as icon species within the environmental protection zone notified by ONEP and NEB. The organization will provide support to the development of eco-tourism activities within the Non-hunting areas in Buriram province as well as the EPA within Suk-Samran district.
<b>Biodiversity-Based Economy Development Office (BEDO)</b>	The BEDO is a newly developed public organization under MONRE inspired by the PES principles. BEDO schemes provide Bio Certificate and market access for biodiversity-friendly products. BEDO experts will provide support in the development of methodologies for assessing the environmentally friendly credentials of goods and services developed within the project as well as advice on other certification schemes that may be applicable.
<b>Chamber of Commerce (CoC)</b>	The CoC has a direct channel of communication with private business interested in environmentally friendly economic activities as well as the capacity to raise awareness of environmentally friendly approaches within the broader business community. The Provincial Chamber of commerce is a member of Provincial Development Committee of which the governor is the chairman. Chamber of Commerce will liaise with tourism entrepreneurs who has potential to be the project champions. Through engagement with the CoC the project will be able to help secure sustainable financing for conservation activities through private sector engagement and development of environmentally friendly goods and services.
<b>Leading Corporates/ private Association</b>	
<p>Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) is at a trial stage in Thailand. PES approach for private business is to start with voluntary matching between corporates with CSR as gratitude to nature, and service providers who guarantee environmental safeguard. Followings are relevant examples of initial stage of PES. Selective cases using Water and its ecosystem services as primary resources for the production sector in Thailand.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Coca Cola in Kaeng Lawa (Internationally important Wetland): application of Water Balance to the Wetland ecosystem</li> <li>2) HSBC in Bung Khong Long (Ramsar site): Fish Bank</li> <li>3) Nokia in Samroi Yod: Mangrove plantation</li> <li>4) Green Hotel in Chumporn (Southern gulf): Business and fishing community as a model of social enterprise</li> <li>5) Hotel Six Sense chains in southern provinces: community products for spa</li> <li>6) Green Net exports of organic products and international labeling</li> </ol> <p>As to elaborate more for the PES feasibility, there exists a village in Buriram whose organic rice production has joined the IFOAM scheme at the verification stage. This can be an entry point for development of a biodiversity friendly product within the Sarus Crane Habitats. The name of this rice is Khao Jib which means "Bird". The likely matching buyer is Nok Air (means Bird Airlines) who might be interested to sponsor/ willing to pay gratitude to the Buriram wetland as Sarus Crane habitat. CBOs will be service providers in wetland conservation and as the guardians of Sarus Crane. Mahidol will support the MRV while PONRE provide enabling policy and legislation support.</p>	
<b>Academic and Research Institutions</b>	
<b>Mahidol University</b>	Mahidol University is a leading educational institution working on action-oriented research. It plays vital role in supporting decision makers with on-sites research and decision support analysis. The University has been engaged in research work associated with the reintroduction of the Eastern Sarus Crane and will be able to work with the project providing technical support to further work on the crane as well as on developing approaches to conservation and recovery plan development and implementation and land use zoning based on ecological criteria.

<b>Thailand Institute of Sciences and Technology Research (TISTR)</b>	The TISTR has experience in developing decision support tools that integrate environmental, economic and social criteria. The institute has undertaken work in this area with key partners involved within water lily conservation and will continue to work with the project to support implementation of activities on the ground within Nakha Sub-district as well as contributing to development of national systems.
<b>The Thailand Research Fund (TRF)</b>	The TRF have been working with communities to established nodes within communities to undertake participatory environmental research and monitoring. Its popular Thai- baan research on wetland biodiversity is the model for integration of local wisdom with scientific back up. The fund will work with the project to identify approaches to integrating community based management and monitoring into ES and critical habitat conservation.
<b>NGOs</b>	
<b>Thai Wetland Foundation / BCST/ IUCN/ local NGOs</b>	The Thai Wetland Foundation is a national NGO committed to supporting Wetland conservation. They work closely with other NGOs and government groups to facilitate conservation actions at local and national levels. BCST is a national NGO active on bird conservation. The organisation is both an advocacy and campaigning group and has scientific expertise and knowledge that is well regarded among the local and international birdwatchers. BCST work closely with the local governments and broad community network, acting as a facilitator for the bird conservation in the Inner Gulf of Thailand. IUCN is an international NGOs working with CBOs in conservation of Water Lily and its habitat protection.
<b>Community Based Organisations (CBOs)</b>	Community-based Organizations (CBOs) provide the experiment ground for the implementation of government policy with proven results. Effectiveness of land use plan and land use change depend largely on the balance between compulsory and incentive measures accepted by community members. CBOs network on natural resources and environmental management is proved to be most active and will act as the nature guardians to guarantee sustainable wise use of resources and ES habitat protection. The project will involve active Civic Group such as the Plern Pri Klong Nakha Eco-tourism Club (part of the North Andaman Tourism Network (N-ATN)); and Khok Kham Conservation Club (part of the Inner Gulf NGO Network) in local conservation planning and implementation.

**B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):**

The project is designed to strengthen and complement ongoing efforts in Thailand to conserve globally significant ecosystems and biodiversity with production landscapes. The project will however also work to deliver tangible economic benefits to local communities within target areas through the provision of capacity building support and the development of environmentally friendly products including eco-tourism. Initial work within one pilot area on eco-tourism by the North Andaman Community Tourism Network has been shown to deliver significant economic benefits to local communities with significant benefits also accruing to female members of the community. It is anticipated that similar benefits will be able to be achieved within each of the pilot sites.

The development of other agricultural products will also help to strengthen existing livelihoods helping communities to both increase the effectiveness and efficiency of their farming techniques and deliver price premiums for biodiversity friendly products. Improved environmental management in these areas will also help to improve environmental quality reducing the exposure of many communities to excess levels of fertilizers, and pesticides. The project will also help to strengthening existing and new local level institutions to enable them to take over the role of managing natural resources effectively.

**B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

The project provides a cost effective approach to conserving the habitats for globally important flora and fauna in production landscapes in Thailand.

The project's design is inherently cost effective focused on both the mainstreaming of approaches to ES species and critical habitat conservation into existing approaches to land use planning and management and providing clear examples of how these approaches can be operationalized to be both financially sustainable and promote green growth. At the national level the mainstreaming of ES conservation into land use planning and management approaches provides a cost effective approach to conserving significant critical habitat areas that exist outside of the PA network within production landscapes. This approach to habitat conservation will not only be less costly than development of new protected areas but will also help to streamline existing data collection, monitoring and management approaches for ES reducing the cost of these processes.

The cost effectiveness of this project will be further ensured by the following elements that have been included in project design.

- *Combination of national and site level activities* – the project combines support to addressing the legislative and capacity gaps for ES and critical habitat level as well as site level support to demonstrate how these land use planning and management approaches can be operationalized. The development of these approaches will be complimentary enabling learning at site level to inform national level approaches and for capacity building at national level to be linked to practical activities at the provincial and site level.
- *Range of site level examples with potential for shared learning* – the pilot site locations encompass different species, different habitats and different socio-economic conditions that are representative of a range of environments within Thailand. As such case study examples from these locations will be able to be utilized by a wide range of locations throughout Thailand. This is particularly true within the Gulf of Thailand where lessons from Khok Kham will have strong resonance within all provinces within the Gulf area between which there is significant potential for shared learning to strengthen existing interests in conservation activities with an initial NGO network already in place. Similarly experiences from the Water Lily pilot site will be able to be shared in a cost effective way through the existing N-ACT.
- *Development of approaches to the production of environmentally friendly goods and services* – by focusing on developing approaches to developing environmentally friendly goods and services the project will establish financially sustainable approaches to land use management. These approaches will provide a cost effective approach to conserving habitats as well as providing clear case studies of how environmental sustainability can be linked with economic production and business development that is highly relevant in the current Thai economy and national development context.
- *Development of incentive based approaches to habitat conservation* - the project will place equal emphasis on assisting compliance with new requirements for critical habitat management as well as approaches to enforcement. This approach will require less intense and less costly levels of monitoring and prosecution as well as presenting a model that other provinces and sites will be keen to adopt. The project will work effectively with local communities and stakeholders to share management responsibilities and costs, as well as to develop sustainable economic activities that can benefit these partners and generate revenue streams for protected areas. This is more cost effective than an exclusionary strategy aimed solely at biodiversity conservation, which is likely to be costly to enforce and unlikely to be sustainable.

The financing of this project is also cost-effective in that the GEF contribution has leveraged a significant level of resources as co-financing from the Government of Thailand. The project will also work closely with existing networks and programmes at site level and national level to help share experiences and broaden the impacts of the projects across Thailand.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:**

The project will be monitored through the standard M&E activities and allowances have been made for this in the M&E budget as in the table below.

### **The Inception Phase**

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first two months of project start with the participation of those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, the UNDP country office and, where appropriate/feasible, regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop will serve to confirm the LogFrame, build ownership for the project results and plan the first year annual work plan.

The **Inception Workshop** will address a number of key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget will be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures will be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting will be held within the first 12 months following the Inception Workshop.

The Inception Workshop Report will serve as a key reference document and will be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

### **Monitoring and Reporting Responsibilities and Events**

On a **quarterly basis** –

- Progress made will be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log will be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. As this is a UNDP GEF project, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as the proposed microfinance scheme for AIGs, are automatically considered as critical on the basis of its innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in ATLAS, a Project Progress Report (PPR) will be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs will be used to monitor issues, lessons learned, etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

On an **annual basis** –

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report will monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management

- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) for the Biodiversity focal area.

### **Periodic Monitoring** through site visits –

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the PB may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and PB members.

### **Project Terminal Report**

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results. The Project Terminal Report will be available, at least in draft, for the Terminal Evaluation.

### **Learning and knowledge sharing**

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

### **Communications and visibility requirements**

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF\\_logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo). The UNDP logo can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08\\_Branding\\_the\\_GEF%20final\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf). Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

### **Independent Evaluations and Audits**

**Mid-term of project cycle** – The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review



will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the second half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project – An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PEB meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

## M&E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Timeframe
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PM</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: US\$ 10,000 (as part of Outcome 1)	Within first three months of project start up
Setting of Baselines and end of project Targets together with Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO/PM will oversee the hiring of specific surveys, studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oversight by PM</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> </ul>	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PM and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RTA</li> <li>▪ UNDP EEG</li> </ul>	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PM and team</li> </ul>	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PM and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: US\$ 28,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PM and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost : US\$ 28,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PM and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> </ul>	None	At least three months before the end of the project
Micro Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ PM and team</li> </ul>	Indicative cost per year: US\$ 3,100	Year 1
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ PM and team</li> </ul>	Indicative cost per year: US\$ 6,000	Year 3
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate)</li> </ul>	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational	Yearly


Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Timeframe
	▪ Government representatives	budget	
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 75,100	

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Chote Trachu	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	19 February 2013

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP/GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i		August 21, 2014	Johan Robinson, Regional Technical Advisor for Biodiversity, UNDP	+66 23049100	<a href="mailto:johan.robinson@undp.org">johan.robinson@undp.org</a>

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

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD:</b> Thailand is better prepared to address climate change and environmental security issues through the enhancement of national capacity and policy readiness.					
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b>					
<b>Indicator 1:</b> Number of national and local (networking) platforms supported and/or strengthened.					
<b>Baseline:</b> As of 2011, there are few (networking) platforms fully operated by the Thai Government and participated by communities and stakeholders.					
<b>Target:</b> At least 3 national and local platforms developed with UNDP support by 2016.					
<b>Indicator 2:</b> Number of climate-related policies and model actions established applied and/or replicated by national and local partners; as well as exchanged in south-south cooperation forums.					
<b>Baseline:</b> As of 2011, no strong climate-related national policies and model actions established, applied and/or replicated by national and local partners.					
<b>Target:</b> At least 3 climate-related policies and model actions established, applied and/or replicated by 2016 with support by UNDP. At least 3 south-south exchange forums conducted addressing the three outputs and other key issues (e.g. mitigation, adaptation, environmental security, climate fiscal framework, etc.)					
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area :</b> UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2018): Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development					
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> BD2					
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> <u>Outcome 2.1:</u> Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation; <u>Outcome 2.2:</u> Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.					
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool. Indicator 2.2: Policies and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.					
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<b>Project Objective:</b> To mainstream globally important biodiversity species conservation into production sectors through improved management of critical habitats.	Hectares of production landscapes legislated as ES critical habitats and protection enforced to assure the long-term survival of ES in Thailand.	There are currently no areas of production landscape that are formally protected due to their importance to an endangered species.	At least 33,893 ha legislated as ES Critical Habitats and managed in a manner that assures the long-term survival of target ES– based on:  600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Sub-district  4,800 ha – which includes 1 km buffer around the 3 non-hunting areas in Buriram Province  28,493 ha which is the entire Nakha Subdistrict	Government gazette	<b>Assumptions:</b> That improved legislative environment and land use planning framework combined with mainstreaming and increased information on ES will support the expansion of action on ES and critical habitat conservation.  <b>Risks:</b> Migratory species status is impacted by population levels outside of Thailand.
	Status of species on the National Red list.	Thailand currently has 1,058 species identified as threatened within the	No overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand (i.e. movement	National Red list assessment	

		country's National Red list of which 6 are extinct.	from one category to another).		
<b>Outcome 1:</b> <i>Enabling framework and capacity to manage ES in productive landscapes strengthened</i>	Approval of ES and Critical Habitat Bill and landuse planning framework by key decision makers	No Act currently exists focused on the conservation of endangered species.	Bill approved by Cabinet	Government gazette.	<b>Assumptions:</b> That improved availability of information on ES and critical habitat status will help to ensure effective land use decision-making taking into account ES and critical habitats.  <b>Risks:</b> The political situation in Thailand prevents effective national level discussion on a new bill or acceptance of a land use planning framework.  The impact of this will be mitigated against by developing effective products that can be utilized over time as well as the development of demonstration sites (under Outcome 2) that are able to show tangible benefits of proposed changes.
	Reduction in threats to ES and critical habitats from landuse change through adoption of landuse zoning for ES and critical habitat conservation within Provincial Plans based on landuse planning framework	Currently no provincial plans have ES focused landuse zoning.	At least 5 provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas	Provincial Plans	
	Management and monitoring system for endangered species operational indicated by number of species for which conservation and recovery plans are in place, critical habitats are defined, management plans in place utilising GIS decision support tool and monitoring is in action.	Basic data system in place but not operational and with limited data management capacity.	Target of 10 species. (Target includes 3 pilot species and 7 additional species).	Species monitoring reports	
	Improvements in capacity development indicator score for ONEP for:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: Existence of operational co-management</li> </ul>	Current capacity assessment score card <sup>11</sup> notes ONEP scores as:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: Score 1.</li> <li>• Indicator 3: Score 1.</li> <li>• Indicator 11: Score 1.</li> </ul>	Capacity scores increase to:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: Score 3.</li> <li>• Indicator 3: Score 3.</li> <li>• Indicator 11: Score 3.</li> </ul>	End of project assessment:	

<sup>11</sup> Please see annex 2

	<p>mechanisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 3: Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups</li> <li>• Indicator 11: Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making mainstreaming</li> </ul>				
	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1.1 Legislative framework for ES conservation strengthened through development of an ES and Critical Habitat Bill</p> <p>1.2 Land Use Planning Framework in place that integrates conservation into land-use planning and allocation decisions</p> <p>1.3: ONEP-led cross-sectoral coordination mechanism in place leading to better planning, coordination, monitoring and enforcement capabilities for ES conservation</p> <p>1.4: Institutional capacity of ONEP to identify ES and monitor its recovery strengthened</p>				
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b></p> <p><b>Critical Habitat management demonstrated for three Endangered Species</b></p>	<p>Number of hectares of production landscape where land owners/users have been capacitated in producing environmentally friendly products.</p>	<p>No areas within the target locations currently use biodiversity friendly production techniques.</p>	<p>600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Subdistrict have been capacitated in sustainable SBS-friendly salt production Communities engaged in salt production<sup>12</sup></p> <p>400 ha of rice fields in within 1 km of reservoirs in Buriram Province have been capacitated in organic and Eastern Sarus Crane-friendly rice<sup>13</sup></p>	<p>Project assessments</p>	<p><b>Assumption:</b> That stakeholders will be willing to uptake new technologies and land use management practices that deliver environmental benefits and sustain livelihoods.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> That the economic situation within Thailand worsens limiting opportunities to obtain price premiums for environmentally friendly products and reducing tourism levels.</p> <p>This will be mitigated against by ensuring capacity building provides landholders with low cost approaches to biodiversity friendly production.</p>
	<p>Stability or increase in numbers of populations of the following species at target sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Spoon-billed Sandpiper</li> <li>– Water lily</li> <li>– Eastern Sarus Crane</li> </ul>	<p>Spoon-billed Sandpiper – 4 at pilot location in Khok Kham</p> <p>Water lily – 0.5ha (blooming area)</p> <p>Eastern Sarus Crane – 25 in ‘wild population’ No wild breeding occurred</p>	<p>Spoon-Billed Sandpiper – no reduction in species number</p> <p>Water Lily – 10% increase in blooming areas – 0.55ha</p> <p>ESC &gt; 25 in “wild’ population and ‘wild’ breeding taking place.</p>	<p>Surveys by project partners</p>	
	<p>Identified threats to targeted species reduced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spoon-billed Sandpiper</li> </ul>	<p>Area of possible SBS habitat that has been converted to uses</p>	<p>No increase in of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok</p>	<p>Surveys by project partners</p>	

<sup>12</sup> Figure based on production of sustainable salt from salt-pans that are used by SBS within Khok Kham sub-district.

<sup>13</sup> Figure based on 15% of farmland within 1km of reservoirs adopting certified environmentally friendly farming approaches during the project duration.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- critical habitat converted for intensive agriculture and urban/industrial development</li> <li>- Eastern Sarus Crane – deaths due to excessive pesticide or hunting</li> <li>- Water Lily – Number of ‘wild’ collected plant specimens to exported out of Thailand</li> </ul>	<p>incompatible for SBS use<sup>14</sup></p> <p>Eastern Sarus Crane – 25 in ‘wild population’ (36 released 4 deceased<sup>15</sup> 7 missing<sup>16</sup>)</p> <p>669,563 Water Lilies exported through Suvarnabhumi Airport during 2006 -2009 (number of ‘wild’ collected specimens not known)<sup>17</sup></p>	<p>Kham location</p> <p>ESC increase in survival rate of reintroduced population. Current survival rate 70% over a three year period.</p> <p>At end-of-project, no export recorded of ‘wild’ collected water lilies at the Suvarnabhumi Airport</p>	<p>Department of Agriculture Report in Suvarnabhumi Airport</p>	
	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>2.1. Management and zoning plans implemented of the identified critical habitats of Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Water Lily and Eastern Sarus Crane in Buriram, Samut sakorn and Ranong Provinces.</p> <p>2.2. Long term financial sustainability strategy for 3 ES habitat sites developed</p> <p>2.3: Strengthening of Extension support to help guide land users to adopt biodiversity friendly land-use practices.</p>				

<sup>14</sup> Baseline populations figures will be provided once the biodiversity inventories are completed by year 2 of the project.

<sup>15</sup> Release numbers and deceased numbers from ONEP Newsletter Q3 2013.

<sup>16</sup> ZPO pers comms

<sup>17</sup> A report from plant quarantine officials at the Department of Agriculture in Sawannaburi Airport estimated that 669,563 Water Lilies were exported during the period 2006 – 2009.

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

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
<b>GEF Review Comments on the PIF</b>		
Please provide information on the indicators for monitoring of Aichi targets at CEO endorsement stage.	The project also advances the strategic targets of the UNCBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020, in particular, 7) By 2020, areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; and 12) By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those in decline, has been improved and sustained. These will be addressed by increasing the number of hectares of production landscape managed sustainably to ensure the conservation of biodiversity, and through ensuring the stability of the three target species of the project namely the Eastern Sarus Crane ( <i>Grus antigone sharpii</i> ), Spoon-billed Sandpiper ( <i>Eurynorhynchus pygmeus</i> ) and Water Lily ( <i>Crinum thaianum</i> ).	Indicators clarified.
Please provide more information on public participation.	The project document provides a more detailed stakeholder analysis identifying key stakeholder groups at national and pilot site levels, which has been reviewed by key stakeholders engaged with the project. The document also outlines a stakeholder engagement plan through identification of lead agencies and other key supporting agencies that will be engaged in project implementation and specifies the need for project outputs to go through a process of multi-stakeholder review, while activities undertaken at pilot sites should be undertaken through participatory processes.	Stakeholder analysis strengthened. Role of stakeholders within project and mechanisms for engagement clarified.
Please provide more information on gender mainstreaming.	Gender mainstreaming has been considered within the project design process with consideration of the potential differential impacts of the project across genders. Requirements for consideration of gender have been integrated into all elements of the project’s activities and a gender mainstreaming section identifies what activities should be undertaken within each project output to ensure gender considerations are effectively addressed.	Gender mainstreaming requirements added within Project document.
Please provide more information on climate change.	Climate change has been identified as exacerbating existing threats to ES and critical habitat conservation within Thailand. Measures to support critical habitat conservation will help to mitigate some of these additional stresses by maintaining ecosystem function in a range of production landscapes. With reference to the pilot project locations improved water management within the reservoirs of Buriram (Eastern Sarus Crane) and enhanced catchment management within Nakha Sub-district (Water Lily) will also help improve both ecological adaptation to climate change as well human adaptation through improved water management (Buriram) and reductions in the risk of flooding (Nakha sub-district).	Climate change’s role in exacerbating existing threats noted within project document and potential benefits of project interventions with regard to responding to climate change also noted.



**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>18</sup>**

**A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:**

The current political situation in Thailand will make the passing of new legislation difficult and time consuming. It is proposed that the project will address this through a combination of effective advocacy and on the ground implementation and the challenges have been identified within the risk assessment.

**B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:**

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>\$67,580</b>			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
International Consultant	24,000	11,440	12,560
Local Consultant	18,000	7,500	10,500
Travel	10,000	1,220	8,780
Trainings/ Workshop/ Conference	6,580	203	6,377
Supplies	5,000	0	5,000
Miscellaneous	4,000	1957	2,043
<b>Total</b>	<b>67,580</b>	<b>22,320</b>	<b>45,260</b>

\*Note: Project Preparation covers the following activities as per the PPG request: (1) Baseline studies, (2) Assessment of Institutional Capacity to support co-management and implementation of project activities, (3) Project strategy and budget.

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

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

N/A

<sup>18</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.