



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 5726 | | |
| Country/Region: | Thailand | | |
| Project Title: | Sustainable Management Models for Local Government Organisations to Enhance Biodiversity Protection and Utilization in Selected Eco-regions of Thailand | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 5271 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Biodiversity |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-2; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$1,758,904 |
| Co-financing: | \$7,560,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$9,318,904 |
| PIF Approval: | May 08, 2014 | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Ulrich Apel | Agency Contact Person: | Johan Robinson |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible ? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated 04/18/2013 | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage. |
| Resource Availability | 3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | • the focal area allocation? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | n/a | n/a |

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | n/a | n/a |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | n/a | n/a |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? | n/a | n/a |
| Strategic Alignment | <p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p> | <p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes. Aligned with BD-2. In addition, the project will contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets, in particular under the strategic goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use, Target 5: the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced; Target 7: areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; Target 8: reduction of pollution to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem functions and biodiversity; and Target 12: preventing extinction of known threatened species.</p> | <p>05/19/2015 UA: Yes.</p> |
| | <p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p> | <p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes. The project is fully aligned with Thailand's "National Policies, Measures and Plans on the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Biodiversity (2008 – 2012)" which is the country's NBSAP.</p> | <p>05/19/2015 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.</p> |
| | <p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> | <p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes.</p> | <p>05/19/2015 UA: Yes.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| Project Design | 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. • Assess whether the project is | 03/19/2014 UA: The project is innovative in its incorporation of specific biodiversity targets into management agreements that will create the necessary stimulus for | 05/19/2015 UA: Please refer to comments at PIF stage, which are still valid. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| | <p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. | <p>local government organisations to create the necessary local incentives and disincentives for local communities and private sector to address biodiversity loss. Social sustainability of the project is ensured through accruing significant socioeconomic benefits at both national and local levels as a result of project interventions. Nationally, the project will secure biodiversity and ecosystem service vital to Thailand's economy. Replication will be achieved through the direct replication and scaling up of sustainable practices and methods demonstrated by the project.</p> | |
| | <p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p> | | <p>05/19/2015 UA: Yes. The project is very close to what was approved at PIF stage.</p> |
| | <p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p> | | <p>05/19/2015 UA: Yes.</p> |
| <p>Project Financing</p> | <p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p> | <p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes.</p> | <p>05/19/2015 UA: Yes.</p> |
| | <p>17. <u>At PIF:</u> Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement:</u> Has co-</p> | <p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes.</p> | <p>05/19/2015 UA: Yes.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | financing been confirmed? | | |
| | 18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. The PPG is within the allowed ceiling and is recommended for approval in line with PIF approval. | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. Report provided in Annex B. |
| | 20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | n/a | n/a |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| | 22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | n/a for a MSP |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | none received |
| | • The Council? | | none received |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | none received |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | 03/19/2014 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends PIF for CEO approval. | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|--|---|
| | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | 05/19/2015 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends the project for final CEO approval. |
| | First review* | March 19, 2014 | May 19, 2015 |
| Review Date (s) | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | | | |

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**