



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

GEF ID:	5330		
Country/Region:	Thailand		
Project Title:	Maximizing Carbon Sink Capacity and Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Peat-swamp Ecosystems		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4951 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-4; BD-1; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$3,224,400
Co-financing:	\$12,960,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,304,400
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Sameer Karki

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3/25/2013 CCM JS No. An endorsement letter signed by Mr. Chote Trachu, dated October 18, 2012 is attached. The funding request stated in the endorsement letter does not match with the amount requested in the PIF. Please match the requested grant amounts in the endorsement letter with the amounts in the PIF. 4/12/2013 CCM JS Upon further discussion it is established that the initial endorsement letter that requests for amounts higher than the amounts stated in the PIF is acceptable.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the		

	all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes. Under CCM, Thailand has approximately \$7 million remaining. 3/25/13 NR/UA: Yes for BD.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	SFM 3/25/13 NR/UA: Available.	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	3/25/2013 CCM JS No. Currently table A shows that the project contributes towards CCM-4, however the project description is geared towards CCM-5. Please revise table A accordingly. 3/25/13 NR/UA: Yes concerning the alignment with BD and SFM. 4/12/2013 CCM JS Yes. Requested change has been made.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes. The project is consistent with Thailand's Strategic Plan on Climate	

	NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Communications, both highlight the role of ecosystems in increasing carbon sinks and mitigation efforts.	
Project Design	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>3/25/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Not entirely clear. Inadequate protection of natural peat swamps as conservation areas, lack of proper technologies and knowledge in maintaining carbon storage in peatlands, and finally inadequate peat-swamp landuse policies are stated as underlying problems that lead to peatland degradation in Thailand.</p> <p>Protected area management budget through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, rewetting efforts by Irrigation department and local sustainable development programs led by local government units have been identified as baseline projects. These are appropriate baseline projects for the proposed project.</p> <p>Minor clarification is requested on the "rewetting" baseline project. Kindly describe the design of the project with hectares that is intended to be rewetted and the hectares the baseline project will leave at risk of fires.</p> <p>4/12/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Yes. The additional information is helpful in understanding the baseline project better.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO</p> <p>Endorsement: Please provide details on the hydrotechnical scheme to be used. Information on infrastructure, and management measures that will be needed to make the scheme operational is</p>	

	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>3/25/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Not entirely clear. Though the project structure and components are well thought out, a few questions remain to fully understand the scope and effectiveness of the project.</p> <p>Component 1: It is stated that large scale private investors are a threat to these peatlands, please explain how component 1 is adequate in deterring such investors. The component also includes setting up of community forests in high-conservation value peat-swamp forests, please reconsider location of such activity in low-conservation value forests.</p> <p>Component 2: It is appreciated that estimates of tCO₂e is provided for protected sinks, sequestration through reforestation and prevention of fires. The estimations given are appropriate for the PIF stage. However, by CEO endorsement more detailed tCO₂e estimates in line with IPCC Tier 2 level is requested, especially given that the project proposes to do in-ground sample measurements. Separate estimations for protection of peatswamps, rewetting, prevention of fires and reforestation and comparison with appropriate baseline scenarios will be expected. These detailed estimations are deemed necessary to fill the knowledge gaps that are the main obstacles in decision making process in the country and international policy design regarding peatlands.</p> <p>Component 3: Given that Thailand has lower peatland coverage compared to other Southeast Asian countries, please</p>	
--	---	---	--

level strategies, which may entail more complicated processes than regional level strategies in the areas where peatlands exist.

Under Trust Fund column in table B, please note the different focal area contributions requested for each component.

4/12/2013 CCM JS

Yes. Explanations provided are appreciated. Focal area contributions have been noted in each component as requested.

Recommended Action by CEO

Endorsement:

In component1 total area to be covered is 128,000 ha, which is larger than thte total area peatlands in the country (64000-75000 ha). Please explain.

Please include measures or leverage measures used in other related projects in the area to ensure that deterrents proposed and awareness raised through the project produces tangible results on the ground.

A more detailed tCO2e estimates in line with IPCC Tier 2 level is requested, especially given that the project proposes to do in-ground sample measurements. Separate estimations for protection of peatswamps, rewetting, prevention of fires and reforestation and comparison with appropriate baseline scenarios will be expected. These detailed estimations are deemed necessary to fill the knowledge gaps that are the main obstacles in decision making process in

		design regarding peatlands.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes. The description provided is adequate for PIF stage. Please see comments for section 7 for the CEO Endorsement stage requirements. 3/25/13 NR/UA: Yes for BD.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes. Local government organizations will be involved in the project in policy planning, capacity building and management. The zoning activities included in the project is expected to assist with livelihood needs of the local communities. By CEO endorsement please identify specific CSOs and local organizations that could be included in the project and elaborate on the benefits they would receive.	
	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)	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes.	

	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>3/25/2013 CCM JS No.</p> <p>3/25/13 NR/UA: Not fully. Please explore potential coordination with the ongoing GEF Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Program.</p> <p>4/12/2013 NR/UA Yes. Provided explanation is sufficient for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please determine avenues of collaboration with the identified related projects and provide details on how the project will build on the carbon accounting systems and protocols that the GMS is working on.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • 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>3/25/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Peatlands in Thailand store a significant amount of carbon and they are at risk of being drained for oil palm plantation. The project acknowledges the needs of local communities and proposes to set up zoning policies in collaboration with the local governments to meet the livelihood needs of the people. The project will monitor carbon emissions and potential for carbon sequestration through the project on the site. This will provide peatland carbon data that are very scarce. The project outcomes could be replicated in the other Southeast Asian countries with similar systems.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear</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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes.	
	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-financing been confirmed?	3/25/2013 CCM JS No. UNDP is bringing \$40,000 as a grant. Overall co-financing is adequate for the project, however the amount that the UNDP is bringing is low, considering its lead role in the project. Please make efforts to increase UNDP's contribution towards the project. 4/12/2013 CCM JS Yes. Increase in UNDP's contribution towards the project co-financing is appreciated.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes. The requested PMC is 5% of the total grant request.	
	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?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Yes. PPG grant of \$120,000 is requested.	

	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	3/25/2013 CCM JS Not yet. Please see comments for sections 2, 4, 6, 7 and 12. 4/12/2013 CCM JS Yes. The PIF is technically cleared.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please see sections 6, 7, 10 and 12.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 25, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2013	
	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.