

# Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3940	
GEF Agency project ID		3642 (PIMS)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production landscape <sup>[1]</sup>	
Country/Countries		Thailand	
Region		South East Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO2: Mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors SP4: Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity SP5: Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services	
Executing agencies involved		Biodiversity-Based Economy Development Office (BEDO)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Through consultations	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations only	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.065	.065
	Co-financing	.207674	NA
GEF Project Grant		1.94	NA
Co-financing	IA own	0	.220405
	Government	5.518	4.832103
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	.035852
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		2.005	1.586626
Total Co-financing		5.725674	5,088,360 + PPG
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		7.730674	6,674,986 + PPG
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2015	
Author of TE		Walaitat Worakul, Andrew Sillitoe	
TER completion date		December 13, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	--	L
M&E Design		MS	--	MS
M&E Implementation		S	--	S
Quality of Implementation		S	--	MS
Quality of Execution		S	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective is for biodiversity conservation to be "mainstreamed into production and marketing of agricultural, forestry and fishery business, in order to create community incentives to conserve and enhance biodiversity in Thailand's land- and seascapes while maintaining appropriate incomes to satisfy family needs for livelihood and wellbeing." (PD p.13)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective as stated in the Project Document (p.30) is 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".

This objective will be achieved by focusing on the following three components and related outcomes:

1. Building national capacity for support of biodiversity business
  - a. Improved institutional capacity and staff competences of BEDO as Thailand's Biodiversity Business Facility for facilitation and support of community-based social enterprises;
  - b. Improved national cooperation and coordination among partners with competencies related to biodiversity business.
2. Piloting Community-based social enterprises in valuable eco-regions
  - a. strengthened community capacities to assess and maintain the benefits of sustainable management of ecosystem goods and services;
  - b. pilot examples of appropriate and documented models for establishment biodiversity-based social enterprises, and
  - c. strengthened community skills and technologies for sustainable production and biodiversity conservation.

3. Mainstreaming biodiversity business into the supply chains of high-value consumer markets
  - a. Demand-driven design, branding and quality assurance of biodiversity-based products to meet the standards of high-end and high-margin consumer markets;
  - b. Appropriate mechanism to reduce transaction costs in the supply chain;
  - c. Improved low-cost investments and subsidy incentives for establishment and operation of Community-based Social Enterprises;
  - d. Increased awareness among commercial market actors about products from community-based social enterprises.

(PD pp.30-31)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation.

#### 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the project as relevant. This TER rates relevance as satisfactory due to the project's good alignment with Thailand's national priorities regarding biodiversity protection and GEF-4 strategic objectives.

Before the beginning of the project, Thailand already had established 400 protected areas (PAs), covering 18% of the territory (PD p.7). Thailand's national policy framework for biodiversity is mainly found in the National Economic and Social Development Plan, and the development concept is rooted in the *Strategies for Development of Biodiversity and Conservation of the Environment* section of the National Policy, Strategies and Action Plan for the Tenth National Economic and Social Development Plan (2007-2011) (PD p.9). To implement this strategy, the government established the Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO) as a public organization under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) in 2007. BEDO is the executing agency for this project. While the Royal Thai Government authorities have made efforts to arrest this environmental degradation in the

country, local communities are not following rules and regulations as they do not have clear social and economic incentives to do so (PD p.8).

The project is also very relevant to the GEF-4 strategic programs under the biodiversity focal area. Under strategic objective 2 (to mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors), the project focuses principally on strategic programme 4 (strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity as it aims to build the regulatory environment for biodiversity businesses and improve the capacity of BEDO. It also supports strategic programme 5 (fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services) as it pilots communication based social enterprises focusing on biodiversity goods and services.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	--

The TE rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates it as moderately satisfactory as, despite good achievements under the first two outcomes, the project was far from achieving its objectives for the third component.

In the paragraphs below, we discuss the extent to which the project successfully achieved the outcomes it was set to achieve:

1. Building national capacity for support of biodiversity business

The project has undertaken a series of activities to support this component. Among others, it designed and implemented a 'Capacity and Competitiveness Development Programme' for BEDO staff. BEDO itself took several steps to improve its capacity, including a recruitment drive and an internal reorganization. Finally, the organization developed an Integrated Biodiversity Management Master Plan and prepared a new national Bill on Promoting Biodiversity Business, which was under consideration at project end (TE p.30).

2. Piloting Community-based social enterprises (CbSEs) in valuable eco-regions

The end of project target for this component was for 10 pilot products to have been developed, with at least five selling into national and export markets. This was not achieved as no product, except for eco-tourism activities, achieved general market exposure (TE p.31). Nonetheless, 18 products and services were developed across six CbSEs. CbSEs established include enterprises making such varied products as soap and cosmetic products, bamboo waste particle boards, chili paste and eco-tourism. As of October 2015, total revenue for those six CbSEs was of \$19,500.

3. Mainstreaming biodiversity business into the supply chains of high-value consumer markets

The TE reports limited success in mainstreaming biodiversity businesses into supply chains. "Whilst successful activities were implemented that strengthened both national and local capacity for

mainstreaming, actions to transform the supply and market chains remained not fully developed.” (TE p.32)

Overall, the project successfully strengthened capacity to support biodiversity businesses and led to the successful creation of several CbSEs, but did not manage to mainstream created businesses into the supply chain as planned.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as satisfactory. This TER rates it as moderately satisfactory due to the delays that affected the project throughout implementation.

Several delays took place at project start. The community-based social enterprises (CbSEs) were established very slowly, and therefore did not have sufficient time at project end “to refine their products and marketing plans” (TE p.33). The PMU management unit faced some challenges in recruiting personnel at project start, and BEDO was not experienced in implementing GEF projects. As a result, the project was not ready for a quick launch following approval. For example, despite having received approval in May 2011, the partner organizations Thailand Environment Institute and Raks Thai Foundation “were not contracted until September 2012 and field work started in November” (TE p.33). As a result, less time was left to meet project targets, which rendered some of them unattainable during such a short timeframe.

However, “apart from the slow start up of the Component 2 field projects, efficiency within the projects implementation was deemed to be acceptable. The PMU ensured that resources for training and support for CbSEs were in place at the right time. During the TE consultation with stakeholders, no negative feedback was received with regard to the efficiency of the PMU / BEDO or the two implementing NGOs with regard to their efficiency in implementing Component 2.” (TE p.34)

No cost benefit analysis was conducted for this project.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Likely</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------

The TE rates sustainability as likely. This TER also rates it as likely due to BEDO’s commitment to further support the development of community based social enterprises (CbSEs) and the low socio-economic, institutional and environmental risks to the project.

#### **Financial Risks – Sustainability**

The most important factor ensuring the future financial sustainability of the project is that BEDO “have stated their committed future support to the CbSEs development” (TE p.36). In addition, the six community based social enterprises (CBSEs) developed as part of the project were, at project end, operational and receiving income. To further promote the CbSEs’ financial sustainability, BEDO also

“prepared a guidebook for the CbSEs on sources of financial support” (TE p.35). While accessing financing may be difficult for some of those CbSEs, especially for costlier items such as machinery, their financial sustainability appears relatively likely.

### **Socio-economic Risks – Sustainability**

Socio-economic risks to the project appear low. Communities involved in CbSEs appear to be collaborating well, and the fact that they are financially benefiting from CbSE activities ensures their continuing support (TE p.36).

### **Institutional Risks – Sustainability**

BEDO stated its commitment “to continue support for the CbSEs to develop and market their products” (TE p.36). Biodiversity business is embedded in Thailand’s institutional framework, and new measures were adopted as a result of the project: BED developed an Integrated Biodiversity Management Master Plan, and prepared a new national Bill on Promoting Biodiversity Business, which was under consideration at project end.

### **Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely**

There are no reported or known environmental risks to this project. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as likely.

## **5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Received co-financing from the Thai government (\$4.84 million) was slightly lower than expected co-financing (\$5.52 million). The TE does not describe how this lower-than-expected co-financing influenced project outcomes.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Several delays took place at project start. The community-based social enterprises (CbSEs) were established very slowly, and therefore did not have sufficient time at project end “to refine their products and marketing plans” (TE p.33). The PMU management unit faced some challenges in recruiting personnel at project start, and BEDO was not experienced in implementing GEF projects. As a result, the project was not ready for a quick launch following final approval. For example, despite having received approval in February 2011, the partner organizations Thailand

Environment Institute and Raks Thai Foundation “were not contracted until September 2012 and field work started in November” (TE p.33). Less time was therefore left to meet project targets, which rendered some of them unattainable during such a short timeframe.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE does not describe the extent to which country ownership influenced project outcomes. The TE confirms that BEDO would be continuing its commitment to pilot CbSEs, and that the large sum of important co-financing provided by the Thai Government shows good country ownership (TE pp. 18, 34).

## 6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E design at entry as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E design as moderately satisfactory due to the completeness of the M&E framework put in place by the project, but noting the weakness of some of the indicators selected.

M&E activities planned and described included the following: project inception workshop followed by inception report, regular monitoring, quarterly meetings with UNDP, Annual Project Report (APR), Project Implementation Reports (PIR), quarterly progress reports, project terminal report, technical reports, mid-term and final evaluations. For each of those activities, the PD included details on responsible parties, budget and time frame required. The total project budget devoted to M&E activities (\$50,640 excluding staff time) (PD pp.70-75) appears modest for a project of this size (\$7,730,674), representing only 0.6% of total budget.

The strategic results framework presented in the PD (pp.85-91) is complete, with all output and outcome indicators being accompanied by baseline values, targets, means of verification and assumptions. However, not all indicators met the SMART criteria, with some not being specific enough, or not being realistically achievable. For instance, the target “*materials developed in the form of print, audio-visual, internet*” (PD p.54) isn’t specific enough. In addition, the objective indicator 1 requires “*at least 5 of the pilot products successfully selling into national and export markets*” (PD p.49) which, given the low level of skills and experience of the community groups, is incredibly difficult to achieve. (TE p.26)

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E implementation for the project as satisfactory. This TER also rates it as satisfactory as all M&E activities appear to have taken place as planned.

The MTR and TE confirm that M&E activities and results-based monitoring took place, including quarterly progress reports, project implementation reviews, quarterly operational reports and independent evaluations. In addition, “the progress of implementation and management issues appear to have been well reported by the project management to the PSC and to UNDP, with lessons learned shared and taken on board by the project partners” (TE pp.27-28).

The TE presents no information regarding the extent to which adaptive management took place as a result of M&E evidence.

## **7. Assessment of project implementation and execution**

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--	--

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP’s quality of implementation for this project is rated as satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately satisfactory due to weaknesses in the project design.

As mentioned in the M&E section above, some of the logical framework targets were overly ambitious. Those unrealistic expectations appear to originate in the project’s assumptions, for example “that pilot communities identified in the ProDoc could move to high end export markets within 4 years’ time. (...) Although the communities were selected on the basis of their awareness and ongoing conservation activities, they have limited experience in doing “real” business. Some of these communities had producer groups from bio-based resources but at a relatively low scale and some communities had no experience of working together as a group before. Experiences from other ongoing community enterprise programmes (e.g. OTOP) illustrate that it usually takes several years before the business



could be leveled off and sustained through regular market mechanisms. Meeting an international market standard is another big challenge as it involves more complicated work processes and longer time. ” (TE p.20)

On the other hand, the UNDP provided useful “backstopping support to the project, along with supporting the Project Board / Steering Committee in carrying out their objectives and also provided independent project oversight and monitoring functions” (TE p.28). However, the UNDP was criticized in the TE for not providing more advice and supervision to BEDO, especially given it was the organization’s first time executing a GEF project (TE p.29).

Finally, the project also “formed a constructive partnership with other donor funded projects including Community based Natural Resources and Catchment Management and Catalysing Sustainability of Thailand’s Protected Area System projects funded by GEF/UNDP as well as the GIZ’s ECO-BEST project via experience sharing forums on topics of common interests such as sustainable resources management and Payment for Eco-system Services. ” (TE p.25)

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---	--

The executing agency for this project was the Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO). In the TE, the BEDO’s quality of execution for this project is rated as satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately satisfactory due to some reporting and execution weaknesses described below.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) appears to have satisfactorily executed the project, both in terms of financial and program management:

“Overall the PMU’s work planning was well managed. No issues were reported with the project’s financial management or disbursement procedures. The implementing NGOs reported no issues in relation to disbursement of funds for the implementation of field projects.<sup>[1]</sup><sup>[SEP]</sup> The Monitoring systems put in place by the PMU utilizing a combination of annual work plans and milestones, affirmed through quarterly reporting and meetings and field monitoring visits were effective in identifying issues and solutions to problems affecting project progress. Risk management and mitigation were considered to be effective and supported by reporting and feedback arrangements. The co-financing arrangement through BEDO ‘staff in kind’ contribution was substantial and met with GEF requirements.” (TE p.24)

However, the MTR identified some issues with project reporting, with financial and M&E reporting lacking detail. However, this issue was fixed following the mid-term evaluation (TE p.25) In addition, and as mentioned above, the project experienced delays at the start, with BEDO struggling to recruit a project manager for the PMU. However, once it was established, the PMU appears to have worked effectively. (TE p.29)

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

***Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There is some evidence of positive environmental change having taken place during the project. The TE reports that the diversity of species inside Kanchanaburi forest was increasing, and that work had been undertaken in Prachinburi to protect the existing remnant wild forest. The Community-based Social Enterprises at Phang Nga and Ranong were undertaking conservation works managing mangrove and cleaning beaches, and that at Ranong was managing a small forest for conservation education. (TE p.37)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project piloted a new development model for community-based biodiversity-businesses in rural communities, which is already providing opportunities for sustainable livelihood generation in rural areas. BEDO has adopted the model and will be promoting it throughout the country. (TE p.35)

In addition, the project reportedly increased the confidence of women in their entrepreneurial skills (TE p.38) and overall improved gender inclusion. This is largely due to the leading role that women took in community-based social enterprises. (TE p.37)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

#### a) Capacities

The project took several steps to strengthen the institutional capacity of BEDO to manage biodiversity business activities in Thailand. The project designed and implemented a 'Capacity and Competitiveness Development Programme for BEDO staff. BEDO itself took several steps to improve its capacity, including a recruitment drive and an internal reorganization. In addition, "the BEDO self assessed Institutional Scorecard evaluation at the start of project was 56. At end of project this had risen to a score of 75" (TE p.37).

#### b) Governance

Governance for biodiversity business management has been improved as part of the project. BEDO organization developed an Integrated Biodiversity Management Master Plan, and prepared a new national Bill on Promoting Biodiversity Business, which was under consideration at project end (TE p.30).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

Not unintended impacts were reported as part of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

No adoption of initiatives at scale was taking place at project end, but BEDO has plans to promote the development of community-based social enterprises beyond the areas initially targeted by the program. (TE p.39)

## 9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

**The report presents the following lessons learned:**

#### Project management

1. The use of time at project start up is extremely valuable and can dictate the end of project results. To maximize the use of project time, where possible, project preparation should start

prior to the official project start up date to ensure that field activities begin in a timely fashion and allow for clarifications of the ProDoc to be undertaken within the Inception Phase.

2. The Inception Phase must result in a common understanding of the project's relevance, objectives, strategies and expected results. The projects logical monitoring framework should be thoroughly analysed against the 'on the ground' reality and agreement reached with the UNDP to make changes that allow for a pragmatic and achievable end of project result.
3. To ensure that the full national perspectives are included into project design, national consulting expertise is required at the project formulation phase. NGOs or CSOs with experience in working with communities should be engaged to identify/verify the right pilot communities based on the criteria set out in the ProDoc.
4. Engaging the NGOs to implement the field projects was the correct decision, however, they did not have the wider expertise in supply chain development., Closer working between the NGOs and BEDO was needed to ensure that expertise outside of the NGOs field was provided.
5. Field based staff from BEDO strengthened the NGO team, however, the field staff were employed on a contract basis and therefore the experience gained is not built institutionally into BEDO i.e. the knowledge disappears at the end of the project as the field staff contracts expire. The project's Exit Strategy needs to ensure that the project and lessons learned are transferred to permanent BEDO staff at all levels prior to project closure.

#### Product development and marketing

1. Where products are developed from scratch the time taken to identify the basic product and develop it into a saleable commodity should not be under-estimated. This includes the time to build community trust, establish a CbSE and develop its capacity as a commercial enterprise. [SEP]
2. Inexperienced CbSEs need to concentrate on producing small simple products. This will allow them to gain craft skills, business skills, organizational skills and confidence prior to expanding into the wider market with more advanced products. By starting with smaller products that are less expensive to produce, the market can be tested and opinions from potential customers gained. [SEP]
3. There are a growing number of CbSE products on the market. Products produced by CbSEs through the business biodiversity concept should be differentiated from other products on the market and their 'ecological' pedigree clearly stated. [SEP]
4. In order to reach higher end markets there is a need to back the product up with good research
  - Need to understand the demand and drivers of market
  - Knowledge and market awareness – who is the end user? What do they want from the product? [SEP]
  - Willingness to pay
  - Need to be able to back up the health / beauty claims with cosmetics
  - Need to have designs that can be constructed and be robust,

- Research into new products

To illustrate the commitment and understanding of CbSE members to biodiversity business, the following stakeholder comments were provided when asked the question ‘What lessons have you learned?’

- Biodiversity based business adds value to the product.
- Biodiversity based business promotes sustainable living and education values. [1] [SEP]
- Biodiversity based business spreads benefits and awareness of the concept to Tambon and surrounding villages. [1] [SEP]
- Biodiversity based business generates interest within other communities who [1] [SEP] become interested and want involvement. [1] [SEP]

(PD pp.38-39)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

**The report makes the following recommendations:**

1. To ensure that the outcomes in future GEF projects are attainable, in future, biodiversity based project designs should undergo a detailed review from national experts to ensure that the full national perspectives are taken into account and that the proposals and targets are both practical and achievable within the timescale of the project. [1] [SEP]
2. To achieve the efficient and effective start up of new GEF projects, the UNDP should actively encourage implementing partner agencies to be fully prepared and have their resources in place to undertake the Inception Phase of the project. This would enable key stakeholders to critically review project proposals, targets and implementation strategies, and where necessary, adjust these to suit the realities on the ground. This additional support is considered critical where the implementing agency has little experience of implementing GEF projects. [1] [SEP]
3. At the finalization of a UNDP / GEF project, in order to improve the dissemination of UNDP / GEF project results both in country and internationally, a knowledge based product should be prepared for each completed UNDP / GEF project and placed on the UNDP / GEF website for public access. The knowledge product should at the minimum highlight the project’s success stories, evaluate the projects approaches and the lessons learned and provide a roadmap to secure project achievements. The responsibility for the knowledge based product should be with the UNDP Country Office.
4. Whilst this project successfully piloted the concept of biodiversity-business as a tool for harmonizing and adopting sustainable management into production landscapes, the project concentrated on establishing new businesses. A number of larger industries are landscape based such as forestry, or they utilize landscapes and seascapes in their development and operations, such as tourism, or they consume landscape such as in the oil or power generating industries. Future UNDP / GEF project planning should consider the possibilities for securing finance from these landscape consumers and users for conservation through developing environmental offsetting arrangements or other mechanisms with the industries concerned. [1] [SEP]

5. In finalizing this project, BEDO need to ensure that the experience and lessons learned from this project are fully transferred to their own staff through the project Exit Strategy. The key lessons learned through the project should be well documented and addressed by BEDO. A Project Completion Report should be developed and widely disseminated to CbSEs, relevant institutions and ministries, NGO organizations, and other stakeholder groups. The Project Completion Report should provide a detailed account of the biodiversity business concept and the role of the project, identify key lessons learned and options for further development of the concept. Most importantly the report should present key guiding principles and a range of best practices drawn from BEDOs project experience that support the replication of biodiversity business initiatives to other areas in Thailand. <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
6. In finalizing this project, the UNDP should seek a written commitment from BEDO stating their support to the pilot CbSEs so they may reach their full potential and ensure that these project supported CbSEs can be promoted as good models for biodiversity business replication. For example, further assistance is required on market assessment and understanding realistic drivers of product demand, product pricing and product marketing.
7. In finalizing this project, BEDOs project field staff currently employed on temporary contracts, should, where possible, be employed on a full time basis. This will ensure that project knowledge will be retained within the organization and that the skills of the field staff can be further developed in order that they can further advance biodiversity business initiatives and provide new and existing CbSEs with technical support. <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
8. Within the nearest future, BEDO/OTOP joint marks should be developed to differentiate the jointly developed products from the general OTOP products. The following principles/actions should be considered:
  - Incorporating the three bio-business principles into the production of selected OTOP products. The three principles are: local content, eco-friendly product, and future of the origins. <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
  - Clear criteria in selecting OTOP groups (e.g. well established in terms of group management; business not too big; use local resources for production; and expressed interest of the groups on conservation activities.
  - Training on biodiversity monitoring to OTOP groups.
9. Within the near future, the certification of business biodiversity based products should provide the evidence that the products are ecologically friendly and support conservation activities, but they contain no ingredients that are harmful to humans nor do they chemicals that are not environmentally friendly (i.e. cosmetics). <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

(PD pp.39-40)

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report discusses the main three components, and provides a good discussion of the extent to which project objectives and planned impacts are achieved.	<b>S</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, but ratings are not always very well substantiated and rooted in evidence.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project adequately assesses sustainability and its various components.	<b>S</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by evidence in the report, and appear comprehensive.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Some financial details are inconsistent throughout the TE, and there are errors in the financial tables. Project costs per activity are not included.	<b>MU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report discusses M&E design and M&E implementation, but only provides superficial information regarding M&E implementation.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

## 11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.