



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9558		
Country/Region:	Thailand		
Project Title:	Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Thailand		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5530 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$75,000	Project Grant:	\$2,381,620
Co-financing:	\$8,669,604	Total Project Cost:	\$11,051,224
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Diana Salvemini

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	The proposed project is aligned with the GEF-6 strategic objectives approved for the GEF SGP, particularly with the following: (a) Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation and (b) Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology and (c) Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits. In addition, the proposed project is aligned with BD-4 Program 9, CCM-2 Program 3 and LD-2 Program 3. This project will	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>contribute to the following Aichi targets:</p> <p>Target 5: By 2020, 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</p> <p>Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives is maintained.</p> <p>Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services are restored and safeguarded.</p> <p>Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems.</p> <p>Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities and their customary use, are respected.</p> <p>Cleared 07/21/2016</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Partially articulated. The proposed project is consistent with the following: the 11th National Social and Economic Development Plan ( 2012- 2016 ); Thailand's Policy and Prospective Plan for Enhancement and Conservation of National Environment Quality (1997-2016); Policies, Measures and Plans for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (2008-2012); the National Climate Change Adaptation Master Plan (2014-2050); and 10- the year Strategic Plan on Combating Land Degradation and Desertification (2008-2018).</p> <p>What's the consistency of the project with the Country's NAP and NBSAP?</p> <p>Please review 07/21/2016</p> <p>Provided.</p> <p>Cleared 08/10/2016</p>	<p>Please see p. 22 under Section 7 (Consistency with National Priorities) for highlighted text describing the consistency of the project with the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).</p>
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Innovativeness - This project proposes to carry out participatory, multistakeholder, landscape management in rural and peri-urban or suburban areas aimed at enhancing</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>social and ecological resilience through community-based, community-driven projects to conserve biodiversity, optimize ecosystem services, manage land – particularly agro-ecosystems – and water sustainably, and mitigate climate change. The proposed project will pilot four distinct landscape planning and management processes in the four regions of Thailand and, building on experience and lessons learned from previous SGP operational phases in Thailand, assist community organizations to carry out and coordinate projects in pursuit of outcomes they have identified in landscape plans and strategies.</p> <p>Sustainability - Sustainability of landscape planning and management processes will be enhanced through the formation of multistakeholder partnerships, involving local government, national agencies and institutions, CSOs, the private sector and others at the landscape level and the adoption of multistakeholder partnership agreements to pursue specific landscape level outcomes. NGO networks will be called upon for their support to community projects and landscape planning processes, and technical assistance</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>will be engaged through government, CSOs, universities, academic institutes and other institutions.</p> <p>Upscaling potential - An essential output of this project is the upscaling of initiatives that have been piloted successfully during previous phases of the SGP Thailand Country Programme. The premise of upscaling in this context is that community adopters of successful SGP-supported technologies, practices and systems from previous SGP phases have been slowly acquiring critical mass to reach a tipping point of adoption by rural and small urban constituencies of adaptive practice and innovation.</p> <p>Cleared 07/21/2016</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>To some extent. Table B which spells out outcomes and outputs is very long, but somehow does not reflect all of the global environmental benefits that are discussed in the alternative scenario. For example, the climate related benefits are hardly mentioned.</p> <p>Please review.</p> <p>07/21/2016</p>	<p>Please see highlighted text in revised Table B.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Provided. Cleared 08/10/2016	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Please refer to #4 above.  In addition, the Table F figures are low. For \$2.38 million dollars, it would be expected to find measures of GEB that are much higher. Please reexamine other SGP projects in the region and update the numbers, or provide justification for such small numbers.  Please review.  07/21/2016  Provided. Cleared 08/10/2016	Please see revised Table F in the PIF. As suggested in the highlighted text, target figures will only be defined as a product of project preparation, in line with other past approved PIFs for SGP Upgrading Country Program projects in GEF6.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. Cleared.  07/21/2016	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes. A total (inclusive of fees and PPG) of \$2,690,000 from Thailand's STAR allocation as follows:  \$969,470 for the project plus \$ 30,530 for PPG from BD \$969,470 for the project plus \$ 30,530 for PPG from CC	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		\$668,935 for the project plus \$ 21,065 for PPG from LD  Cleared 07/21/2016	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not at this stage.</p> <p>Please address the comments above.</p> <p>07/21/2016</p> <p>Yes. The proposed project is being recommended for clearance.</p> <p>08/10/2016</p> <p>The project is being recommended for clearance and PPG is justified.</p> <p>A new OFP was appointed in January, 2017. The endorsement letter provided was signed in June 2016. The At CEO Endorsement, the Agency must provide an updated the letter of endorsement signed by the active Operational Focal Point.</p> <p>10/25/2017</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 21, 2016	August 01, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 10, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 25, 2017	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		