# 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-5; BD-1; SFM/REDD+-1;** | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | **$120,000** | Project Grant: | **$3,224,400** |
| Co-financing: | **$13,382,711** | Total Project Cost: | **$16,847,111** |
| PIF Approval: | **April 24, 2013** | Council Approval/Expected: | **June 20, 2013** |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | **Ulrich Apel** | Agency Contact Person: | **Sameer Karki** |

| 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**? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>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.<br><br>4/12/2013 CCM JS<br>Upon further discussion it is established that the initial endorsement letter that | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage. |

*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.

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 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 **resources available** from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | • the focal area allocation? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. Under CCM, Thailand has approximately $7 million remaining.<br><br>3/25/13 NR/UA:<br>Yes for BD. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | NA | n/a |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | NA | n/a |
| | • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | SFM<br><br>3/25/13 NR/UA:<br>Available. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| Strategic Alignment | 4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**?<br>*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).* | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>No.<br>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.<br><br>3/25/13 NR/UA:<br>Yes concerning the alignment with BD and SFM.<br><br>4/12/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. Requested change has been made. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 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? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br><br>Yes. The project is consistent with Thailand's Strategic Plan on Climate Change and its Second National Communications, both highlight the role of ecosystems in increasing carbon sinks and mitigation efforts. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| 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? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>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.<br><br>Protected area management budget through the Ministry of Natural Reources 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>4/12/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. The additional information is helpful in understanding the baseline | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. GESEC comments at PIF stage were taken into account and have been adequately responded to (refer to comments matrix) and reflected in the design of the project as per the UNDP project document. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | project better.<br><br>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on the hyrdotechnical scheme to be used. Information on infrastructure, and management measures that will be needed to make the scheme operational is requested. | |
| | 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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, | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. GESEC comments at PIF stage were taken into account and have been adequately responded to (refer to comments matrix) and reflected in the design of the project as per the UNDP project document. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 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.<br><br>Component 3: Given that Thailand has lower peatland coverage compared to other Southeast Asian countries, please clarify the importance of having national level strategies, which may entail more complicated processes than regional level strategies in the areas where peatlands exist.<br><br>Under Trust Fund column in table B, please note the different focal area contributions requested for each component.<br><br>4/12/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. Explanations provided are appreciated. Focal area contributions have been noted in each component as requested.<br><br>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement:<br>In component1 total area to be covered is 128,000 ha, which is larger than thte total area peatlands in the coutnry (64000-75000 ha). Please explain.<br>Please include measures or leverage measures used in other related projects in the area to ensure that deterrents | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | proposed and awareness raised through the project produces tangible results on the ground.<br><br>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 the country and international policy 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<br>Yes. The description provided is adequate for PIF stage. Please see comments for section 7 for the CEO Endorsement stage requirements.<br><br>3/25/13 NR/UA:<br>Yes for BD. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 9. Is there a clear description of:<br>a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and<br>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. Local government organizations will be involved in the project in policy planning, capacity building and | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. CSO and local organizations have been identified at this stage. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | engagement explained? | management. The zoning activities included in the project is expected to assist with livelihood needs of the local communities.<br><br>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<br>Yes. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>No.<br><br>3/25/13 NR/UA: Not fully. Please explore potential coordination with the ongoing GEF Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Program.<br><br>4/12/2013 NR/UA<br>Yes. Provided explanation is sufficient for PIF stage.<br><br>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement:<br>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. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. Collaboration mechanisms have been established and details on carbon accounting systems provided. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**.<br>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.<br>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.<br>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br><br>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. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>No changes compared to PIF stage. Refer to PIF stage assessment. |
| | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. Fully in line with what was approved by Council at PIF stage. |
| | 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? | | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| 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<br>Yes. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 17. At PIF: 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 | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>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 | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. UNDP grant has been increased to $300,000. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | with its role?<br>At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed? | its lead role in the project. Please make efforts to increase UNDP's contribution towards the project.<br><br>4/12/2013 CCM JS<br>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<br>Yes. The requested PMC is 5% of the total grant request. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 19. At PIF, 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?<br>At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>Yes. PPG grant of $120,000 is requested. | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | NA | n/a |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| | 22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. Refer to comment/response matrix in the Annex B of the CEO endorsement |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | request. |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | n/a |
| | • The Council? | | n/a |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | n/a |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | **24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?** | 3/25/2013 CCM JS<br>Not yet. Please see comments for sections 2, 4, 6, 7 and 12.<br><br>4/12/2013 CCM JS<br>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?** | | 12/23/2014 UA:<br>Yes. All items to be considered at CEO endorsement stage have been adequately addressed. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO endorsement. |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | March 25, 2013 | December 23, 2014 |
| | 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.**