Terminal Evaluation, Integrated Community-based Forest and Catchment Management through an Ecosystem Service Approach Project

PIMS 4033 GEF

May - October 2017

Final Report

Region	**Asia-Pacific**
Country	**Thailand**
Implementing Partner	**Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment**
GEF Operational Focal Area / Strategic Programme	**Biodiversity BD SP4;** **Sustainable Forest Management *and* CC SP6** **Management of the LULUCF as a Means to Protect** **Carbon Stocks and Reduce GHG Emissions**

Reviewers:
John Poulsen
Walaitat Worakul

Acknowledgments

The team conducting the Terminal Evaluation wishes to extend gratitude and thanks to several individuals, agencies and units:

The staff of the Regional Environmental Offices (REO 1, 5, 12 and 14) and their project partners, Municipalities, local communities, private sector operators, amongst others, for sharing their experience and extending their hospitality during the visits to the pilot sites.

The Office of the Permanent Secretary and Project Management Unit, National Experts/Consultants.

UNDP Country Office of Thailand for their help and assistance in carrying out the TE, as well as UNDP GEF Portfolio Coordinator.

The Regional Technical Advisor.

The UNDP Evaluation Office for comments on the drafts of the report.

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AWP	Annual Workplan
CAS	Capacity Assessment Scorecard
CBFCM	Community-based Forest and Catchment Management
CO	Country Office (of UNDP)
CP	Country Programme
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CSO	Civil Society Organization
ET	Evaluation Team
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DMCR	Department of Marine and Coastal Resources
DNP	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plants Conservation
DWR	Department of Water Resources
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Green House Gas
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MONRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
MTR	Mid-term Review
NEB	National Environment Board
NIDA	National Institute of Development Administration
NESDB	National Economic and Social Development Board

NFP	National Forest Policy
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Product
OPS	Office of Permanent Secretary
ONEP	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning
PAO	Provincial Administrative Organization
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
PB	Project Board
PCD	Pollution Control Department
PIMS	Project Information Management Systems
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PONRE	Provincial Office for Natural Resources and Environment
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PMU	Project Management Unit
QPR	Quaterly Progress Report
RECOFTC	Regional Community Forest Training Center for Asia and the Pacific
REO	Regional Environment Office
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit (of UNDP-GEF)
RID	Royal Irrigation Department
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor (of UNDP-GEF)
RTG	Royal Thai Government
SRF	Strategic Result Framework
TAO	Tambon Administrative Organization
TE	Terminal Evaluation
Thb	Thai baht
TGO	Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization
TOR	Terms of Reference
TT	Tracking Tool
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WCMO	Watershed Conservation Management Office

Executive Summary

Project Summary Table

Project Title	**Integrated Community-based Forest and Catchment Management through an Ecosystem Service Approach Project**			
GEF Project ID			**At endorsement (million US$)**	**At completion (million US$)**
UNDP Project ID	**4033**	**GEF financing**	**1.758182**	
Country	**Thailand**	**IA/EA own**	**0.35**	
Region	**Asia-Pacific**	**Government**	**12.21**	
Focal Area	**Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Forest Management**	**Other**		
FA Objectives (GEF 4)	**BD SP4 Sustainable Forest Management *and* CC SP6 Management of the LULUCF as a Means to Protect Carbon Stocks and Reduce GHG Emissions**	**Total Cofinancing**	**12.56**	
Executing Agency	**Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment**	**Total Project Cost**	**14.318182**	
Other Partners Involved	**N/A**	**ProDoc Signature (date project began)**		**27/02/2012**
		Operational Closing Date: Original 26 Feb 2016	**Revised: 26/06/2017 (due to 9 month delay starting)**	**Actual: 30/09/17**

Project description

1. The project objective was to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up integrated Community Based Forestry and Catchment Management (CBFCM) practices through innovative financing mechanisms. To achieve this the project will strengthen systemic capacities in sustainable forest and catchment management at the local, regional, and national levels (Outcome 1), and support the expansion of CBFCM coverage throughout the country through pilot testing of defined Payment for Environmental Services (PES) and bio-carbon financing mechanisms (Outcome 2).
2. The project would build capacities of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) to harmonize policies, plans, and legal instruments to support CBFCM and PES and bio-carbon schemes. It would also support the establishment of a multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM, with active participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, Regional Environmental Offices (REOs), Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) and Royal Forest Department (RFD). This would act as an effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing and capacity development

mechanism. The project would also strengthen national capacities to promote PES (including and bio-carbon) in order to strengthen community incentives for effective forest and catchment management.

3. The project would support scaling up of CBFCM best practices using PES and bio-carbon financing mechanisms at four sites, led by four Regional Environment Offices (REOs). These sites include Mae Sa Catchment (North), Tha Chin Catchment (Central), Lam Sebai Catchment (Northeast), and Pa-Ngan Catchment (South). The project would strengthen capacities of local authorities, landholders and the private sector to ensure that innovative financing mechanisms (PES) are used for improving livelihoods, global biodiversity conservation benefits, and GHG emission reduction from land use and land use changes. In order to do this, the project would support catchment level ecosystem services valuation (including bio-carbon) and assessment of benefits, trade-offs and various opportunity costs of land-use options taking into full account the ecosystem services. Biodiversity friendly PES and bio-carbon financing strategies would be implemented, with institutionalization of payment distribution structures that fully consider gender and other social equity aspects.

Evaluation Findings

4. The project design was complicated, it:
    1. Introduced new and innovative concepts to Thailand.
    2. Overestimated the capacities at different levels
    3. Over-estimated the strength of CBFCM in Thailand.
5. Site selection compounded these challenges and the logistical challenges to the project are considerable.
6. The inception phase was long due to the frequent changes in the project administration units within MONRE and the process of explaining project concept/strategies as well as to discuss management set up and establish financial procedures had to start over and over again.
7. Progress and performance was affected by a number of external and internal events (e.g. changes of Project Manager and big gap while finding the replacement, institutional changes within MONRE which affect project line of execution, lack of systematic and cohesive technical back-up, etc.)
8. Execution was initially slow, began to improve prior to the MTR, and was then subject to further delays due to investigations following financial audit. During the second quarter of 2017, project activities have accelerated, frantically, trying to catch up before project closure.
9. The project has generally not used the technical assistance effectively and there is still considerable confusion surrounding PES Ecosystem provisioning services (except water) have been valued, but willingness to pay (or other methodologies) for tourism, water and other services to determine prices have yet to be conducted. Bio-carbon financing has proven to be too expensive in terms of entry into the system and no longer viable by the time of implementation, and effective schemes have not been developed. Capacities to effectively strengthen community management of natural resources have been demonstrated. Importantly, REOs and communities are gradually increasing their natural resource economic skills and their ability to working collaboratively, including within communities. It has successfully introduced the idea of economics in natural resource management.
10. There remained some weaknesses in the project's log frame. Thus, some indicators for Outcome 2 could be considered impact indicators rather than progress indicators. And some of the important achievements by the project cannot be reflected by indicators and targets.

11. The project is very relevant to, and objectives received broad support at the national, provincial, regional, and local levels. The project may have made important contributions towards catalysing changes in the way natural resources/ecosystem services are valued at the local and national level.
12. At the pilot site level, the project has been supporting a process of community empowerment to manage and benefit from natural resources/ecosystem services, and there has been positive signs of replication of approaches and results to other areas.
13. By the closure date, the project has supported several MOUs between local communities and private sector, government enterprises and government agencies to continue collaboration on and support to community-based forest and natural resource management. These MOUs could well serve as foundation for future PES agreements should both parties can reach consensus on economic values of the ecosystem services provided and the willingness to pay by the private sector.

Evaluation Rating Table

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA & EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry	MS	Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	S
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	Quality of MONRE Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	MS
Overall quality of M&E	MS	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MS
3. Assessment of Outcomes	***rating***	**4. Sustainability**	***rating***
Relevance	R	Financial resources	ML
Effectiveness	MS	Socio-political	ML
Efficiency	MU	Institutional framework and governance	ML
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	Environmental	ML
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	ML

Achievement Description

Measure	TE Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	**Moderately Satisfactory**	• The project has generally underperformed in terms of achieving the overall strategy. Although many of the outstanding activities at the MTR were subsequently completed, this only happened due to several extensions granted. The activities were condensed into a short time span and the timing was dictated by the imminent project closure rather than by strategic planning. • The MTR proposal of paraphrasing the strategy "creating an enabling environment for both CBFCM and PES while operationalising PES schemes based on the management of community forests" would have been appropriate, but

		the ET finds that even then the Project Document would need to be retro-fitted. • In reality, the project has addressed different aspects of payment for ecosystem services: both financial payments from downstream beneficiaries of services delivered by upstream actors, and financial payments or investments to 'pay' for negative consequences/impacts on downstream ecosystem services (affecting actors living or depending on downstream ecosystems/services). The former was probably what was intended in the ProDoc, but the lack of a working definition of PES pervaded the whole project, from inception to closure. • The enabling environment has certainly improved during the lifetime of the project, including PES in the National Environmental Policy and REO strategies, explicit provincial strategies on sustainable natural resource management through technologies and innovation, and inclusion of NR workplan at TAO level, at least in the project pilot areas. • There is still much work to be done before legislation is developed for both CBFCM systems and PES (including bio-carbon) schemes. • At the pilot sites there were no operational PES schemes, but there have been solid achievements in terms of MOUs between community conservation groups/networks and private sector to support CBFCM through construction of weirs in watershed areas, rehabilitation of mangrove forest, improved water quality in canals, and monitoring of carbon stock from community forest, etc.
Project Design	**Moderately Satisfactory**	• Not-with-standing its many flaws, the project addressed novel, complex and complicated but also potentially game-changing policy issues for the management and sharing of ecosystem services between stakeholders, in the context of community-based forest and catchment areas in Thailand. • A key take-home message is that strengthening CBFCM and developing PES schemes take time and requires a proper well-thought-out strategy of components, and a good understanding of the pathway for achieving such impacts. This could have been formulated as a roadmap, detailing the sequence in which the components and specific interventions should be ordered and implemented.

Progress Towards Results	
Objective: Create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scalingup integrated CBFCM practices through innovative financing mechanisms. **Achievement Rating**: Moderately Satisfactory	• There is some promising sign at national level that PES will be picked up by the Forest Resource and Land Unit under MONRE's Office of National Reform and Reconciliation, which would help to facilitate the scaling up of PES, which has already been included in all REO's NR strategies. The pilot sites have done relatively well on part of the CBFCM. Although the real PES agreements have not existed yet, the MOUs with private sector have laid the foundation for further negotiations, given that the momentum is continued through newly established working groups/ committees in all pilot sites.
Outcome 1: Strengthened policy environment and systematic capacities to promote sustainable community-based forest and catchment management through PES and bio-carbon financing mechanisms **Achievement Rating**: Moderately Unsatisfactory	• Overall, there has been some/limited progress and achievements. As reported in the MTR, progress was initially slow but had increased in pace and most key elements (listed in the PIR 2015) were in place at the MTR. In a document by the Environmental Policy and Institutional Consultant developed during the final quarter of the project, it was suggested that a separate unit within MONRE should be established to continue and institutionalise the PES and bio-carbon efforts as a necessary precursor for developing lasting policies (this suggestion was also part of the ProDoc for the CBFCM project). Although PES was contained in the 11th National Plan, in the current 12th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2017-2022), the term PES has been removed and rather focus on economic tools but there is limited or no reference to how these economic tools can be used in practice. It should be noted, however, that the National Environment Quality Plan (2017-2022) does contain a PES conceptual framework • As a result of CBFCM, the Permanent Secretary of MONRE has expressed that all 16 REOs should have strategic plans for NRM applying PES. This will require facilitators with proven experiences in strategic PES planning who however do not currently exist. Thus, regional strategic plans incorporating PES, although developed, may not reflect the actual and practical implementation of the concept. • The ET also notes that most departments within MONRE have been familiarised with PES though perhaps to varying degree but may not yet have been equipped with practical implementation skills and knowledge. • Some TAOs have included PES or PES-like activities in their development plans. So far, this has happened at least at Mae Sa and Tha Chin pilot sites.

	• With respect to systemic capacities: This has not been achieved to a substantial level, mainly because consultants have effectively only been engaged on an ad hoc basis to conduct specific economic valuations rather than based on a systemic approach to build capacities. • There is still no clear working definition of PES and a defined community forest or a *unit of management* which broadly equates to community management and is functionally efficient at a scale which represents existing social (community) arrangements and discrete ecosystems. The previously reported (by the MTR) lack of clarity regarding PES and the schemes proposed still persist to some degree. • Overall, the ET feels that more detailed and explicit activities from the onset would have helped to steer the efforts towards achieving the outcome.
Output 1.1: Harmonized policies, plans and legal instruments to support **Indicator**: Number of national policies and plans (identified) that incorporate PES and bio-carbon financing mechanism in support of CBFCM **Achievement Rating**: Moderately Unsatisfactory	• So far, there has been no harmonization of policies, plans and legal instruments conducted as part of and during the lifetime of the project. • According to the project design, an analysis to identify gaps and issues in relevant Acts and policies (i.e. Environmental Quality Act 1992 and other relevant departmental and regional plans and policies) will be conducted by the project. Based on the findings, a multi-sectoral / multi-agency consultative process will be facilitated to develop guidelines for the integration and harmonization of PES and bio-carbon financing schemes and mechanisms for CBFCM into existing policy as well as providing a framework and guidelines for new policy development that advocates CBFCM through PES and bio-carbon financing. • At the time of writing the TE, there was no report that the gap analysis has been conducted nor the multi-sectoral / multi-agency consultation platform for such purpose had been established.
Output 1.2: Functional multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM in place with participation of all regional CBFCM networks, REOs, ONEP, and Royal Forestry Department that facilitates effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing, self-capacity development and access to PES and biocarbon databased **Indicators**:	• According to the project design, this platform should be organized on a regular basis and to secure sustainability of this mechanism it will be attached under the National Environmental Board. At the time of the TE, the functional multi-sectoral platform/ mechanism for CBFCM has not been created and institutionalised. Some ad hoc dialogues, however, were undertaken among various agencies, including DNP, RFD, BEDO, ECO-BEST project, etc. to share experiences on the implementation of PES, or, PES-like projects and schemes.

Existence of multi-agency/multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM/PES-bio-carbon dialogue, consultation with inclusive participation from all relevant government organizations, CSOs, academia, private sector, and CBFCM community networks **Achievement Rating**: Moderately Unsatisfactory	• The database system work conducted by the Geographical Data Consultant is – at the time of TE – at long last under way. According to the ProDoc, the database will provide a central collection point for PES/bio-carbon information, case studies and research studies which could be accessed by the REOs and communities when planning and implementing their PES schemes. So, the late development of the data base failed to serve this purpose. This effort should have received higher priority earlier during the project. • The process of database development does not appear as participatory as originally intended and seems lacking focus. The actual applicability of the database has not been well defined and the way in which it will be integrated into the overall policy development process and framework also appears unclear. • The ET observes that the database may be developing in the direction of a market place for announcing PES opportunities and where potential buyers and sellers can find each other. Such a "PES dating site" in itself would be an interesting and novel approach for future PES schemes.
Output 1.3: National capacities enhanced to promote incentive based forest and catchment management through local communities **Indicator**: Institutional capacities strengthened at national and reginal levels (4 pilot REO training centers) to implement PES and biocarbon financing schemes in support of CBFCM. **Achievement Rating**: Moderately Unsatisfactory	• The intended national CBFCM coordinating agency/department within MONRE, to be responsible for the management of a CBFCM database and collection and dissemination of information, best practice, etc., had not been established at the time of writing the TE. As referred to above, a proposal to establish such a unit was anticipated and intended to be proposed to the Board before the project closure. MONRE Permanent Secretary has issued a Ministerial Order to establish MONRE-based Office to Mobilise National Reform, Strategy and Reconcilation. The Office will ensure that strategies and implementation of all departments/operational units under MONRE are consistent with the national reform and national reconciliation agenda in national resource management. The Office will include 4 operational units, i.e. Forest Resource and Land; Water Resource; Environment; and Administration. • Chief of OPS, MONRE who has been assigned to be the Project Director of the CBFCM project since the MTR is the chairman of the Forest and Land Unit under this order. Hence, policies related to PES and other economic measures to motivate sustainable land use management will be automatically included under the work of this Unit.

	• The ET did not find that the project had implemented any formal and systematic capacity building of REOs (particularly the 4 REOs directly involved in project implementation). The concept of PES was introduced in the early year of implementation but at conceptual/theoretical level. Another technical training on PES methodologies and economic instruments in natural resource management was conducted very late in the project. REO staff and communities in pilot sites gradually gained more insight and skills to implement CBFCM and PES through trial and error process. However, there was little effort from the project to facilitate the sharing and consolidation of knowledge generated during the implementation. • Technical consultants were engaged on a job-by-job basis, mostly to conduct studies on economic valuation of natural resources not to build capacity of REOs on PES planning process. • The skills in stakeholder analysis& engagement, communication and management, conflict resolution, mediation and contract negotiation were considered to have been improved in some REOs but not yet to the level that they could become effective trainers on these. • Thus, the intention to develop REOs to become training center on CBFCM and PES has not been achieved and the need for capacity for dealing with forest and catchment management areas, as described in the ProDoc and referred to in the MTR, has not been delivered by this project. • The ProDoc states that the government agencies lacked capacity in monitoring of GHG emission reduction and capture through landuse and landuse change, and explained that the project would help to build these capacities. In the early year of implementation, the project trained REO staff on biocarbon assessment. Some REOs (e.g. REO 12) has inturn trained community forest committee on biocarbon monitoring techniques which have been put into practice by the Committee throughout the project lifetime. There is no evidence of training on other GHG emission reduction monitoing techniques apart from forest-based carbon sequestration.

Outcome 2: Expanded CBFCM coverage through pilot testing and up-scaling of best practice using PES and biocarbon financing schemes and mechanisms. **Achievement Rating:** Moderatelt Satisfactory	• The pilot testing has resulted in some expanded CBFCM coverage in some of the pilot sites. • Although the precise modality of community-based forest management in Thai context is still a work in progress, the project has supported pilot communities in voluntary community-based conservation activities which resulted in expanded areas benefiting from sustainable forest and catchment practices. Construction of living weirs in Mae Sa catchment has gone beyond the original pilot communities to those in nearby disctricts through community networking process. More farmers benefit from sufficient water irrigated to their fields. In some villages, the weirs aslo serve as recreational area for the villagers. Mangrove rehabilitation and conservation in Tha Chin catchment contributed to expanded mangrove forest coverage whist regular community-based river watch scheme in Pittayalongkorn canal resulted in improved water quality in the canal and better hygiene condition for households along the canal. Construction of artificial coral reefs along Pha-Ngan coastlines helped to increase fish stock and marine resources which proves to have both economical and environmental values to the pilot site. • The project has made advances in terms of creating situation where stakeholders convened to discuss shared issues and measures to collectively address them. MOUs between local community groups/networks and private sector/ state enterprises/ government organizations were established to express common interest to collaborate on sustainable environmental conservation activities which will benefit all. However, the agreements were not yet based on the ecosystem services valuation. • There is a strong need for documentation of a case study where the PES approach/scheme has worked well, both in terms of process (how was it operationalised) and in terms the key elements of a functioning PES scheme (i.e., beneficiary, provider, ecosystem service, willingness to pay and price per unit, costs avoided by beneficiary, means of equitable distribution of payments, etc.). This process should be facilitated by the to-be established PES unit within MONRE. The documented cases could be used as references for scaling up/replication of the tested models

Output 2.1 Capacities of local authorities, landlorders and the private sector enhanced to ensure market-based payments and harness innovative financing for improved livelihoods **Indicator** Number and type of PES and biocarbon financing schemes developed and applied (in place) for CBFCM in the 4 pilot sites **Achievement Rating**: Moderately Satisfactory	• Capacity of local authorities, landholders and the private sector has been improved but that capacity building has been ad hoc and sporadic, rather than conducted in a systematically planned manner. • An important achievement is that the broad range of local stakeholders (including municipalities, private sector operators, government agencies, CSOs, local communities on several levels, monks, etc.) have enhanced capacity to work together. This has also worked towards creating a common understanding about how sustainable livelihoods is linked to and dependent upon ecosystem services and health. • There still appears to be substantial uncertainty and/or disagreement regarding the definition of PES. However, several rather solid PES-like cases have been developed, particularly water provisioning in the Mae Sa catchment, coastal protection by mangrove forests in Tha Chin catchment. The project has made the first tentative steps in the right direction towards future PES schemes linked to CBFCM.
Output 2.2 Catchment level ecosystem services valuation (including bio-carbon) and assessment of benefits, trade-offs, and opportunity costs of and use options **Indicators**: • Ton of CO2 sequestered and/or avoided emissions within the framework of implemented PES schemes accumulative of all 4 pilot projects area catchment basin sites • Global biodiversity values maintained or enhanced at pilot sites • Livelihood quality Index **Achievement Rating**: Moderately Satisfactory	• Valuations have been conducted in all sites, and mostly led by consultants with some participation from local communities, municipalities, etc). However, the ET finds that the resulting reports were not integrated and communities have not been able to use/apply the reports for negotiations, both because the reports have not been sufficiently communicated to the communities and because communities have not sufficiently been equipped with the negotiating skills to make use of these valuations • The project has not been able to demonstrate bio-carbon for reasons beyond the control of the project. The carbon assessments have been made and this has established both a capacity to do so and an understanding of why and how this can be used in the future, but at this point in time it is uneconomical to establish such a scheme. However, local communities increased their understanding of the bio-carbon concept and means of local monitoring, through trainings provided by the project. • Baseline data on key indicator species in 4 pilot sites have been collected. At the time of TE, no updated data were made available. However, it was reported during the interviews with local communities that conservation activities conducted in pilot sites have, to a certain extent, reduced threats on the environment and enhanced bio-diversity values in respective areas. For

	example, more fish and marine species in coastal areas in Pha-Ngan from coral reef rehabilitation; increased water flow in Mae Sa catchment areas as a result of living weir construction, and better water quality in the Pittayalongkorn canal inTa Chin catchment as a result of the 'river watch' activity. • Livlihood quality of household in pilot sites were identified by income level and sustainable livelihood index. At the time of the TE, baseline data was available. The project was in the process of hiring a consultant to collect the updated data. Since there have not yet been any real PES schemes up and running, any increase in household income, if any, will be less likely associated with PES activities.
Output 2.3 Land-use based and biodiversity friendly PES&biocarbon financing strategies for CBFCM with result-based, equitable, transparent and unified payment distribution structure in place in 4 REO regions **Indicators**: • Capacities of local authorities and community land users in land-use aoptions that enhance ES and to ensure market-based payments from PES and biocarbon financing for improved livlihoods. Environmental Quality of key ES parameters such as water quality, soil nutrient levels, sedimentation. • Number of national and regional level forums, meetings and documents highlighting best practice and lessons learned in using PES and biocarbon financing for CBFCM **Achievement Rating**: Unsatisfactory	• The project did not sufficiently pursue strategic and systematic approaches to develop PES strategies for CBFCM. The experience achieved thus far has been based on a trial and error approach, in part due to the lack of clear working definitions of PES and CBFCM. • The experience gained by the REOs so far is building a sound basis for developing PES schemes in the future but completed working examples in the lifetime of this project, considering the baseline at the start, are too ambitious. • The process taking place at the REO level has countered many of the obstacles which invariably stand in the way of effective community-based natural resource management. • The capacities of the communities are still deemed insufficient for them to manage natural resources sufficiently effective according to any robust PES schemes. Additional confounding factor is the extent to which they will be able to negotiate fair deals with the private sector. • There has been some expansion in areas managed according to CBFCM approaches. However, this expansion has not involved or applied PES because the link to real(istic) buyers was not established during the lifetime of the project. The MOUs then serve as mutual agreements indicating some contributions from private sector/local governments to support community's conservation schemes/activities which may or may not have direct benefit on private sector's business. • There is no systematic documentation of best practice and lessons learnt in using PES and biocarbon financing for CBFCM.

Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learnt

14. The CBFCM project has delivered a substantial set of achievements in spite of the multitudes of problems that the project has faced during its lifetime. Some of those problems have been self-inflicted from the design-phase (especially lack of working definitions; poor tactical cohesion between the two outcomes; PMU design and structure; inconsistencies and lack of clarity in the logframe, indicators and targets; and site selection) as well as the lack of ownership in project implementation, resulting in lack of adaptive management. There were also other challenges which were-in fairness- beyond the control of the project, particularly recurrent institutional changes within MONRE and the political instability.
15. At all levels (national, provincial, regional, tambon), the CBFCM project has contributed to lay the foundation for fundamental changes to natural resource management and valuation in the Kingdom of Thailand. Certainly, capacity building by the project has lacked a systematic and strategic approach, and the confusion caused by a lack of a clear and shared working definition of PES has been pervasive throughout the project.
16. At the local levels, the CBFCM project has helped re-shape the way in which local authorities interact and work with both local communities and companies. Local communities are not yet well equipped to be strong negotiators, but the project has contributed to enhance their empowerment to benefit from the natural resources and the ecosystem services which the management of their lands can provide to others. The communities, in a way, also benefit from the better managed ecosystems.
17. The inclusion of bio-carbon as a focus of the project was valid considering the continuing global/public interest in this. However, bio-carbon is - strictly speaking – simply one of many types of ecosystem service. The declining price of bio-carbon was certainly beyond the control of the project, but it essentially rendered the bio-carbon component of the project to be ignored.
18. The enabling environment for PES in community managed forests and catchment management has improved during the lifetime of the project, but the extent to which this can be solely and directly attributed to the project is less clear.
19. When examining the ProDoc here near project closure, some key aspects which would have contributed to the overall achievement of the project objective still remain incomplete, particularly the establishment and institutionalisation of multi-sectoral mechanism for continuity of CBFCM-PES policy feedback and dialogue at the national level; and the proven cases of CBFCM schemes linked to innovative financial schemes (PES) on the ground which are ready for scaling up.
20. Moreover, due to the several substantial delays in project execution, the conducted activities have often been performed in an untimely manner and without proper planning. This has made many efforts less strategic. For example, ahead of imminent project closure, several activities (e.g. technical training on PES and economic tools/ methodologies; development of and training on PES database) have been conducted – while very valuable in their own right – but with the high risk that the results will not be useful in the absence of a clear exit strategy. It will be important to ensure that the results are well documented and communicated to relevant stakeholders and processes, to reduce the risk that they are left hanging.
21. Through the work at the pilot sites/catchments located at different parts of Thailand, from upstream mountain areas (Mae Sa) to downstream lowland (Tha Chin), the project has revealed that there is a general potential for PES. At the closure of the project, there is no real operational/functional PES schemes in place, but some significant ground work has been done and there are some important case studies which have shown good potential.

22. The future policy and legal development of PES will depend on a strategic understanding of the full set of dimensions for well-functioning PES schemes. For this, the experiences from the pilot site efforts by the CBFCM project has contributed important lessons learnt.

Recommendations

Before the project closure:

23. The project has delivered a substantial set of achievements which could be further strengthened to fully achieve the project's intended objective in the long run. In the absence of the project's exit strategy, it is recommended that a concluding workshop is conducted before the project's official closure date, not only to share key achievements and lessons learnt but also to discuss how the project results/initiatives could be sustained/further developed at ministerial, regional and community levels. The workshop should include key stakeholders from every level and result in a consensus on the sustainability plan beyond the project phase. Recommendations from the TE may be used as a starting point for further review /discussion by the participants and to reach at conclusions how they could be practically adjusted to suit the realities on the ground as well as at the policy level. It should result on a roadmap for further steps.

After the project closure

Outcome 1:

24. A PES management unit or similar mechanism should be established within MONRE in order to:
    - promote/support PES and application of economic instruments in natural resource management by REOs and Provincial Environmental Offices
    - host and promote active use of updated data base on PES
    - monitor and document grounded process/lessons from the original 4 pilot sites to be used as references for policy recommendations and replication
    - based on grounded knowledge/lessons learnt, provide recommendations to develop enabling policy, strategies and mechanism to support PES

Outcome 2

25. PES Management Unit (or the like) should continue to support the 4 pilot REOs and respective communities to implement their signed MOUs (e.g. providing technical advice through consultants, ensuring sufficient budget to support REOs, etc.)
26. Participatory Action Research should be conducted at each site by a team of key stakeholders (e.g. REO, key agencies, private sector, communities) who are implementers of the MOUs and PES-related activities to develop the 'know-how' on PES implementation in real context.

Site-specific recommendations

Mae Sa Catchment

27. At the community level, Mae Sa and Mae Raem Watershed Working Group will be key mechanism driving conservation activities identified in the MOU as well as community action plan which has been absorbed into TAO's development plan. Meanwhile, the Mae Sa Watershed Management Committee (chaired by Mae Rim Chief District Officer with line agencies and REO as members) should play a supporting role, e.g. providing technical advice, additional budget, and further promoting PES agreements between community groups and other potential buyers of the services where opportunities arise.

28. Participatory Action Research should be conducted on the implementation process of different PES arrangements (current and emerging). Through the action and reflection cycle of PAR, communities together with private sector and government agencies will gradually generate knowledge and better understanding how the PES mechanism could be implemented in the real context for win-win-win (environment-community-private sector) benefits.
29. Community conservation networks to continue their activities, including monitoring improvements in natural resources in their areas, using economic valuation instruments (to be trained by NIDA). The findings could be used as basis for fair negotiations with potential buyers of PES or for resource mobilization from funding sources
30. Village # 9 in Mae-Raem sub-district, Mae Rim district which has been an active pilot village should be supported to serve as a learning site on CBFCM (e.g. living weirs, sustainable forest management, fire protection, etc.), and be equipped with IEC materials for visitors
31. REO1 is replicating PES in a few other provinces. The process should be closely supervised/guided and monitored by REO 1 and NIDA, with systematic documentation of best practices and lessons learnt. Information on grounded implementation should be fed to the future PES Management Unit under MONRE on a regular basis to influence necessary policy support

Tha Chin

32. After the project closure, Office of Internal Security Operation Command (ISOC) will coordinate implementation of activities under all MOUs which have been signed under the project. The future PES management Unit (in collaboration with NIDA) should provide training on the practical concept and methodologies of PES to a focal point from the ISOC, leaders of the four networks responsible for implementing the four different MOUs as well as their partners from private sector. The training should include discussion how each MOU could potentially be developed in the future into PES agreements, if the conditions permit.
33. REO should support community networks to establish a result-based monitoring mechanism and systematic documentation of best practices and lessons learnt from their implementation. The lessons learnt should then be fed back to PES Management Unit

Lam Sebai

34. The Governor of Ubol Ratchathani has appointed two committees to carry on the project initiated activities after the project ends. The Advisory Committee is chaired by Chief District Office with representatives of concerned agencies and REO 12 as members. The Implementing Committee is chaired by Mayor of Hua Don TAO; membership comprises of representatives from communities and private sector. REO 12 as secretary of both committees should ensure that the two committees will continue to be active in supporting and driving activities under the current MOUs between Lam Sebai conservation group and private sector.
35. At this stage, it is not yet clear how MONRE will provide specific support to REO 12 to ensure that these efforts will continue. However, if the recommendation of the TE team to establish PES management unit under MONRE is materialised, all REOs including REO 12 should receive support from this Unit to implement their signed MOUs in terms of technical advice through consultants, ensuring sufficient budget to support REOs, etc.

36. To move from MOU to PES agreement, further work is needed. For example, to monitor and prove that the conservation of Dong Yai forest has contributed to certain amount of carbon credits. SS Alcohol company could pay for significant amount of this to off-set GHG emission from their production process and include it in their Down Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI) report.

Koh Phangan

37. The signed MOUs should be implemented and potential to further develop them to PES agreement should be explored.
38. The 'Friends of Pha-Ngan Network' should be sustained as key driver to implement ideas jointly developed under the Sustainable Pha Ngan Plan.
39. Future linkage to mid-stream and upstream communities on sustainable environmental practices (e.g. through organic farmer groups) should be explored and stengtened through implementation of Sustainable Pha Ngan Plan with possible expanded activities to cover upland buffer zone forest areas. To the least, an action plan to solidify and continue the modest organic farming efforts should be developed.
40. Any further expansion to cover community based forest and catchment activities (from upland-the forest-covered mountains to lowlands), should be based with careful analysis/identification of drivers and possible PES/biocarbon issues.

Recommendations for future UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

41. For a project to test new and complex concepts, a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) should be engaged throughout the project life to ensure that the underpinned concept/approach is consistently well understood and implemented.
42. More attention should be given to the inception process/phase of the project to ensure thorough understanding by key stakeholders of the project objectives, strategies, and important technical concepts as well as to secure their genuine commitment.
43. NIM proves to be a good management modality for long-term sustainability of project initiatives. However, country ownership must be firmly committed and the project should not be seen as an additional responsibility by implementing partners. It should be counted as part of their KPI, in order to get priority.
44. In addition to providing co-finance, the Implementing Partner should set up internal support system to ensure continuity of the project despite the change of administration, the willingness to address financial and operational complication and the ownership and the commitment to see the project through to the end in partnership with the IA. An example of concrete solution is to set up a special unit for project implementation. The role of the unit is to ensure efficient and effective management of the project and sustainability of its results. This unit should be operated through special arrangement to streamline bureaucratic procedures based on the approval of the top management of the IP and should be sufficiently staffed. In general, the project activities are in line with the mandates of the IP. Hence, it should become an integral part of the organization's operation and performance systems. This may require necessary revision of current KPIs to reflect extra work staff put into the project.
45. Prior to project start up, a guideline on financial and administrative procedures which harmonize UNDP and RTG rules should be developed to support smooth and timely project implementation (streamlined, practical and transparent). Training on UNDP financial/audit requirements which is

ususally provided to PM and project administration staff (both project-employed and government) during the inception phase should be refreshed on a regular basis or when need emerges.

46. UNDP should set up a small 'rescue' team to ensure that issues concerning project management are dealt with in a timely manner
47. UNDP should provide a more rigourous training and coaching process on work planning and budget planning process to ensure that the IP understand and has the capacities to develop a result-based work plan and budget plan that could meet the financial requirement of spending up to 80% of the advanced budget before the new request can be made. This is a part of capacity building process for the government counterparts to get to know result-based management and to apply it to their day to day works.

REVIEW OF MTR

48. Recommendations Summary Table (MTR – page xi), updated with the ET's assessment of the extent to which the MTR recommendations had been adopted/followed, by the time of writing the TE.

Rec #	Recommendation	Entity responsible	Actions since the MTR
	The project requests an extension past the scheduled closing date of February 2016.	Project Board to agree Project Director and UNDP CO to propose process and action.	Done.
	Greater delegation of decision-making to the PMU, specifically the Project Manager and streamlining the decision-making process so that decisions become actions.	Project Director and PMU.	Not implemented sufficiently. Indeed, it appears that there is less delegation than at the MTR; this may in part be related to the move of the PMU from PCD to the Office of the Permanent Secretary.
	Engage a substantive Chief Technical Adviser.	Project Board to decide. Project Director and Project Manager to draft TOR, UNDP to assist in drafting TOR and procuring suitable candidates.	A CTA was not hired, in part as it (according to the PM) appeared difficult to identify an appropriate candidate and the fact that the project implementation was pending for 6 months after the financial audit. Instead it was chosen to rely on the set of technical consultants. The ET feels that this has had serious negative impact on the

			project's ability to deliver planned outputs and on the overall integration and use of technical support. The ET argues that a CTA would have ensured a higher degree of cohesion and integration of complex technical issues.
	Improved internal and external Communications.	PMU, given the short time available to the project an outside service provider might be engaged to drive this process.	Neither internal nor external communications improved, and an external service provider was not engaged.
	Improved strategic use of technical consultants. Linkages between technical inputs should be improved and the TOR of consultants should reflect a more process-oriented approach. As in the case of RECOFTC their TOR should reflect the role of the Consultant as a multiplier and service provider as well as conducting studies or training.	PMU, UNDP to assist with drafting TOR.	Consultants were engaged too late, and their respective TORs were not sufficiently integrated (most likely, due to the lack of a CTA). Therefore, it became difficult to ensure real contribution toward project objectives/outcomes. Training provided was not systematic. Training provided by consultants from NIDA on PES and economic instruments for natural resource management proved to be useful but occurred at the very late stage of the project.
A	**Outcome 1: Strengthened policy environment and systemic capacities to promote sustainable community-based forest and catchment management through PES and bio-carbon financing mechanisms**		
A1	Operationalise the multi-sectoral platform and the Implementing	Project Board	There were only ad-hoc meetings of Multi-

	Partner (which is now the Office of Permanent Secretary of MONRE) could help guide the process so that least one PES policy document is endorsed by Government.		Stakeholder Platform (MSP), aimed to exchange experiences. Therefore, the MSP is not yet a driving force/mechanism for policy-making. Some indication of interest by high-level policy-makers at MONRE towards adopting PES. Each REO is due to develop NRM plans with PES as part thereof.
B	**Outcome 2: Expanded CBFCM coverage through pilot testing and up-scaling of best practice using PES and bio-carbon financing schemes and mechanisms**		
B.1	The role and expertise of RECOFTC in working with communities on project coordination forest and catchment management should be fully utilised to support implementation.	PMU, UNDP, and RECOFTC to assist in drawing up a plan to better utilise RECOFTCs capacities through a participatory approach.	It was not clear if this has occurred but towards the end of the project, RECOFTC senior advisor was engaged to facilitate the discussions with communities on key lessons learnt in each pilot site.
B.2	Continue to use the existing SRF/LFM. Changing indicators with four months remaining will be too disruptive.		Done, with some efforts to improve consistency between the original Prodoc and the Thai translation version.

49. Tracking Tool

50. The GEF Tracking Tool (TT) SF/REDD-Plus Projects was conducted during the PPG Phase (July 2011), and repeated before the MTR (March 2015) and completed ahead of this TE (2017). The ET is unaware whether completion of the TT contributed to the delay in conducting the TE.
51. The MTR proposed to replace 'sector policy/regulation framework formally adopted by the Government but weak enforcement mechanisms' with 'sector policy/regulation framework have been formally proposed but not adopted'.
52. The TE finds, in the interim since the MTR, that there has been some progress in the policy/regulatory framework, i.e. the National Environment Policy which provides framework for

sectoral strategies includes the PES concept; and the inclusion of PES as part of all 16 REO's NR strategies which provides rooms for PES implementation in all regions, subject to priorities set by MONRE.

53. The Carbon Stock monitoring system is reported to have been established. REOs have apparently been trained during the early stage of the project (before MTR), but it appears that communities have adopted it only in REO 12 (Ubol Rachathani, under REO's supervision).

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation

54. This is the independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the UNDP-supported GEF-financed project on ***Integrated community-based forest and catchment management through an ecosystem service approach*** to be carried out in accordance with the ToRs (Annex 1).
55. The objectives of the TE – as per the ToR - are to assess the achievement of the project's results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.
56. In doing so, the Evaluation Team will conduct the TE according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Terminal Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.
57. The assessment of project achievements shall be conducted using a systematic approach and through a structured set of questions which arise from the project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs as amended and recorded in the Project Inception Report, as well as evaluated in the Mid-Term Review (MTR) Report. In doing so, the Evaluators will make reference to the indicators and targets in the LogFrame (Annex 1). It is recognized that when addressing whether particular results have been achieved, the reply may reflect progress towards the sought result. The assessment shall attempt to identify what would be required for the sought result to be achieved. A self-assessment will be developed and provided to the PMU for its self-assessment of project results.

1.2 Scope and Methodology of the TE

1.2.1 Scope of the TE

58. The TE reviews the following (cf. Annex 1):
59. **Project Finance and Co-Finance:** The TE assesses the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Variances between planned and actual expenditures are assessed and explained, and recent financial audits, as available, taken into consideration. The ET received assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data, to complete the co-financing table.
60. **Mainstreaming:** The TE assesses the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.
61. **Impact:** The ET provides an assessment of the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that are brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

62. **Project design**: the problem the project was intended to address and the underlying assumptions, its relevance and feasibility, whether it addressed national priorities, and to what extent the project's objectives were grounded in reality and a broad national and local support.
63. **Progress towards results**: The achievements of the project will be assessed, compared to what it set out to do, as well as the impacts that it has had, by examining the project's strategic results framework (SRF). The ET determines the degree to which it has successfully strengthened the policy environment and systematic capacities to promote sustainable CBFCM through payment for ecosystem services (PES) and bio-carbon financing mechanism, and; expanded CBFCM coverage through pilot testing and up-scaling of best practices using PES and bio-carbon schemes and mechanisms. As part of this process the TE will also compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed before the TE.
64. **Project implementation and adaptive management**: critically assess the suitability of the management arrangements described in the Project Document and the actual arrangements following the project's inception and consider the quality of project execution and support from the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP). In particular the MTR will look at the:
65. **Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems**: review the project's monitoring tools and systems including the project's performance, impact, and financial aspects as well as checking that there is a broad and transparent participation in the monitoring process.
66. **Stakeholder Engagement**: assess the level and effectiveness of stakeholder engagement at all levels (national government, institutional, local government, local community, private sector, etc.).
67. **Reporting**: assess the quality and timeliness of reporting including the use of appropriate reporting to inform decision-making and ensure transparency and accountability, whether reporting is informing decision-making or hindering it.
68. **Communications**: assess whether and how the project has communicated internally (with project stakeholders) and externally with a wider audience.
69. **Sustainability**: validate the risks identified in the Project Document and other project reports (e.g. PIR, ATLAS Log) to assess the appropriateness and if necessary identify any additional risks to the sustainability of the project's outcomes:
    1. **Financial risks to sustainability**: what is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends?
    2. **Socio-economic risks to sustainability**: what are the political risks, is there sufficient "ownership" of the project outcomes to ensure their continuity, will benefits continue to flow to targeted groups after the close of the GEF-funded project, is there sufficient stakeholder support for the project, etc.
    3. **Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability**: has the project created a robust enabling environment to ensure the continuity of project outcomes after the close of the GEF-funded project, is there sufficient technical capabilities, a supportive policy and regulatory framework, etc.
    4. **Environmental risks to sustainability**: the TE identifies any environmental risk that might jeopardize the project's outcomes, beyond the time of project closure.
70. **Implementation Arrangements**: The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resided with the UNDP CO in Thailand. The UNDP CO contracted the evaluators and ensured the timely provision of travel arrangements within the country for the ET. The Project Team was responsible

for liaising with the ET to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

71. The TE provides recommendations for efforts immediately prior to and past formal project closure in order to maintain the outcomes and objective beyond the project's lifetime.
72. The TE will analyse the findings and assess the project's overall performance and impact. The findings of the TE are set out in this Final Report following the advised and recommended structure, by the UNDP Country Office of Thailand. Finally, the report includes a section setting out the TE's evidence-based conclusions, in light of its findings.

1.2.2 Methodology

73. The team conducting the TE consisted of two persons, an international and a national Consultant. The total number of working days was 58-person days, of which the in-country mission was from May 28th until June 20th, 2017 for both consultants, for interviews and visits to the pilot sites.
74. In accordance with the monitoring and evaluation policy of UNDP and the GEF, this evaluation is guided by, and applies, the principles of: Independence, Impartiality, Transparency, Disclosure, Ethics, Competence and Capacity, Credibility, and Utility. A collaborative and inclusive approach has been applied. This has in effect been a joint effort between the Evaluation Team and the project implementers and stakeholders, while also ensuring and retaining the independence of the Evaluation Team.
75. The evaluation was conducted using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria were provided to the Evaluation Team (Annex 1) who made specific changes to be discussed with the UNDP at the beginning of the evaluation mission.
76. Data and information was sought through:
    - Desk review of key documents and websites; the list of documents provided to the Evaluation Team is in Annex 4.
    - Discussions with UNDP CO senior management and the UNDP/GEF RTA.
    - Consultations with key Government organizations, partners and other stakeholders, including beneficiaries; see below for list of organisations and individuals with whom interviews were held.
    - Discussions with implementing partner (MONRE) in Bangkok, and regional offices (REO 1, 5, 12, 14) in charge of pilot activities.
    - Meetings with other Project Board members, including Project Director and Project Co-Manager assigned from MONRE.
    - Consultations with consultants used by the project.
77. The Evaluation Team has emphasized and strived for participatory and direct consultations through face-to-face meetings whenever possible. When this was absolutelynot possible, telephone and/or electronic communication were used instead.
78. Empirical evidence collected was validated through a triangulation approach: i.e., evidence from one source was validated from other sources, and documentation in reports, interviews and surveys complemented each other. If the information was available only from consultations, the Evaluation Team sought to corroborate opinions expressed and information given, by address the same issues and questions to more than one interviewee. Anecdotal evidence was only taken into account if in the judgment of the Evaluators the information was important and the source considered reliable. In such cases, the possible limitations of this information have been noted.

79. Self-assessments of the project have also been conducted. These concentrated on the views of project implementers (Project Director, PMU and regional offices) as being responsible for the management and achievement of the project outcomes (guided template tables were developed by the Evaluation Team). The views of other stakeholders (including beneficiaries) was also sought through direct discussions.
80. During the in-country mission, the Evaluation Team consulted and held focused meetings and discussions with as many stakeholders as possible. The field mission to Thailand included visits to all project pilot sites:
    - Mae Sa Catchment (North), Chiang Mai Province
    - Tha Chin Catchment (Central), Samut Sakhorn Province
    - Lam Sebai Catchment (Northeast), Ubol Ratchathani Province
    - Pa-Ngan Catchment (South), Surat Thani Province
81. At these four pilot sites, key stakeholders included REOs, Community-based organizations and networks, government sector (e.g. local government, protected area and forestry officials, coastal and marine resources official, agriculture, internal security officer), as well as various private businesses (e.g. in tourism, drinking water, beverages, hotels, etc.).
82. The UNDP CO arranged interviews with the following personnel and organizations and individuals:
    - Project Director
    - Project Manager
    - Project consultants for Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
    - Directors and Project Officers at REO 1, 5, 12 and 14
    - Project Field Officers
    - Representatives from pilot communities
    - Private sector in each pilot site who are involved in the project implementation
    - UNDP Country Office in Bangkok
    - RECOFTC
83. The Evaluation Team sought to ensure that the above list included all key stakeholders, and reflected a balance between government organisations, local communities and other stakeholders, including potential sellers/buyers of PES services, thereby being truly representative of the project context.
84. The Evaluation strove to ensure that interviews were conducted with the understanding that individual interviewees maintain their confidentiality. In general, the specific sources of specific comments do not add anything to the argument.
85. The Project Document is the signed contract for delivery of the agreed results, products and services, and it was therefore the core basis for the Terminal Evaluation, because signatories bind themselves through the ProDoc to deliver the specified results, and were accountable on the basis of the ProDoc. As noted by GEF, "*the results framework included in the project appraisal document submitted to the GEF for approval/endorsement by the CEO establishes project outcome expectations. At the time of project completion, these ex-ante expectations generally form a yard stick for assessment of outcome achievements.*" The Logframe was analysed in terms of any revisions during the lifetime of the project, thereby addressing the Relevance of the original, and the changed, project design.
86. Achieved results in relation to Outcomes and Outputs were assessed initially through the interviews and self-assessments of the Project Management and these were verified through consultations with stakeholders and visits to project sites, and reviews of Annual Work Plans, Quarterly Plans and Reports.

87. GEF through the APR/PIR, as well as the MTR, were important for the Terminal Evaluation.
88. Furthermore, the TE included an assessment of: the application of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan; knowledge management and learning as a basis for decision-making; the application and effectiveness of adaptive management; and, the applicable Tracking Tools.
89. Preliminary findings were presented at the end of the mission, to both UNDP Country Office of Thailand, and, at MONRE to PMU and relevant REO representatives from the regions involved in the project. The draft version of this Terminal Evaluation report was circulated among stakeholders and beneficiaries, whose comments were fully considered in preparation of the present final Terminal Evaluation report.
90. According to the GEF Evaluation Office Guidelines and as noted in the ToRs, selected aspects of project performance has been rated according to the six-point scale from Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory. Ratings are supported by evidence and our findings have been substantiated to the extent possible.
91. The core deliverables of the Terminal Evaluation were:
92. **Inception Report submitted to UNDP CO**;
93. **Presentation** with initial findings at the end of the evaluation mission, to project management (and REOs) and to UNDP CO;
94. **Draft Full Report** (submitted to UNDP CO) – which upon reviews by RTA, PMU and implementing partner (MONRE), and GEF OFPs, and Results Based Management Unit in New York – was revised;
95. **Final Report** taking into account comments received and presented with an audit trail documenting comments and how they were addressed, for clearance by the CO and RTA.

Evaluation Criteria and Ratings

96. The Evaluation Team assessed project performance, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (Annex 1) – performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification). This evaluation covers the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings have been provided on the performance criteria described (applying rating scales described in Annex 1).

Project Finance / Cofinance

97. The Evaluation Team assessed the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. This required access to project cost and funding data, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures was assessed and explained. The Evaluation Team requested access to results from recent financial audits, through the assistance from the UNDP CO and the Project Team, and obtained financial data necessary to complete the co-financing table (Annex 1).

Mainstreaming

98. The TE has assessed the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

99. The TE has assessed the extent to which the project achieved impacts or led the way for the achievement of impacts. Thus, it has been taken into account that some impacts may only materialise and come to fruition after the end of the project period.

100. Key findings sought to be brought out in the evaluations included whether the project demonstrated:
    a) verifiable improvements in ecological status
    b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or
    c) progress towards these impact achievements.
101. Assessing overall performance against the project objective, outcomes and outputs as set out in the Project Document, project's Strategic Results Framework (SRF[1]) and GEF increment, and other related documents;
102. Assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
103. Analysing critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project;
104. Assessing the sustainability (financially, socio-economically, institutionally and environmentally) of the project achievements
105. Assessing the project relevance to national priorities of both the Government of Thailand and the UNDP (including achieving gender equality and human rights goals);
106. Providing recommendations to ensure sustainability, and provide lessons learned from the process of implementing the project
107. PMU and UNDP Country Office (CO) provided a list of key individuals to be interviewed. The ET found that the list was indeed both representative and comprehensive and, based upon the initial study of the project's documentation a reasonable agenda and profile representing the project participants. The list was continually being revisited through an iterative process with the UNDP CO and PMU during the evaluation. At the onset, the ET wished to ensure that interviewees included both men and women in as balanced a manner as possible. It turned out that many if not the majority of interviewees were women, particularly at REO level and at the community level. The ET sought to ensure that all interviewees were treated equally and their views respected according to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System (2008)[2].
108. All persons interviewed were informed that the interviews would be considered confidential to the extent that the TE would not quote directly from the interview and would not attribute statements in the TE report to anyone. Throughout the TE report, the ET has included only information which could be validated.

1.2.3 Limitations of the TE

109. As also emphasized in the MTR, the CBFCM project, especially through its design and intervention strategy, has been a complex project which attempted to introduce and mainstream several complex and new concepts and management approaches, viz. PES and bio-carbon financing schemes. It has worked with sustainable use and community-based approaches to natural resource management, which involves solid understanding and handling of property regimes and governance. In addition, the project aimed at working at and across multiple hierarchical levels, including the intention to establish a national framework and at the four separate pilot sites. Just the logistical challenges posed were substantial.
110. The logistical challenges with organising the in-country mission have been considerable. The aim was to ensure that all pilot sites were visited and to meet with as many stakeholders as possible, both at the pilot site level and in Bangkok. An able professional translator was engaged to assist

[1] Referred to as the log frame matrix (LFM) in the Project Document

[2] Available at: http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/100

the international consultant, thereby ensuring that interviews and discussions could become as technical and informative as necessary.

1.3 Structure of the TE report

111. The remaining part of the report is structured in three parts:

112. **Section 2** provides a description of the project including contextual information which is necessary to understand the key events which have unfolded and have to a large degree shaped the project, its performance, progress and overall impact of the project.

113. **Section 3** describes the findings of the Terminal Evaluation, and consists of three sub-sections. Section 3.1 provides the main findings of the evaluation and addresses the design and formulation of the project, as well as assumptions and risks, lessons from and links to other relevant projects, planned stakeholder participation, approach to replication, the UNDP's comparative advantage for this kind of project, and, finally, management arrangements. Section 3.2 provides the findings on the project implementation, including on adaptive management, partnership arrangements, feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management, project finance, monitoring and evaluation, as well as, the execution by implementing agency, executing agency, overall implementation/execution, coordination and other operational issues. Section 3.3 covers the project results: overall results, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, country ownership, mainstreaming, impact, as well as the sustainability aspects, including financial resources, socio-economic, institutional framework, governance, environmental and overall likelihood.

114. **Section 4** provides the main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt of the evaluation based upon the evidence, reasonable argument and the professional opinion of the Evaluation Team. This section identifies the corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project, as well as, actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project (recommendations), proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.

2 Project description and development context

2.1 Project Start and Duration

115. The project was developed to be a four-year project. Harmonising the policy and planning framework were to take place in tandem with developing working PES schemes at the CBFCM-level. With both of these in place PES and CBFCM could be scaled up.

116. The project preparation grant (PPG) took place in 2010 and the Project Document was signed in February 2012. The project implementation started in October 2012 with an Inception Phase lasting until May 2013. The long period of Inception phase was due to the frequent changes of the administrative unit who would be the focal point of CBFCM within MONRE. In the first year of project implementation, changes in project administrative unit took place three times and everytime that the project was shifted to new administrative unit, the the process of explaining the concept of the project, the management set-up, and financial arrangement started all over again. The first PM resigned in June 2013 and there was a 15-month gap before the new PM was recruited.

117. The MTR was conducted in September 2015 after an eighteen months delay at a time when the Terminal Evaluation had originally been scheduled to take place. The MTR resulted in an extension of the project closure from the originally planned date of 26 Feburary 2016 to 26 June 2017, and a further extension was requested until September2017 of official closure has been granted, on the basis that there would not be new procurement nor contract issuance happened during the extended period. This Terminal Evaluation was conducted during May-June 2017.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

118. Thailand is located at the centre of the Indochina Peninsula sharing borders with the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Cambodia, Malaysia, and the Union of Myanmar. The total land area is 513,000km^2 with a population of over sixty-seven million (2010) and an annual population growth rate of 0.34[3]. There has been a rapid rise in urbanisation in recent years[4] from thirteen per cent of the population living in urban areas in 1965 to fifty-four per cent in 2000[5]. While Thailand has made significant progress as measured by the Human Development Index (HDI) rating (0.778[6]) and is on track to meet most of its Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015[7], certain groups and geographical regions still face considerable development challenges including unsustainable natural resource use and poverty is still a widespread and genuine concern in rural northeast, the far north, and far south of the country[8].

119. Thailand is situated within two major biogeographical regions (Indochinese region in the north and Sundaic region in the south). As a result, it is one of the richest countries in Southeast Asia in terms of natural resources. A precise figure of Thailand's forest cover is difficult to obtain because of discrepancies in forest category definitions, assessment methods and types of maps used. The Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) data shows that around thirty-seven per cent (18,972,000 ha) of the country is covered by forest[9]. Of this total, twenty-one per cent (approximately 3,986,000 ha) is classified as primary forest, which is the most biologically diverse and carbon dense type of forests. Thailand also has some 3,986,000 of planted forest[10]. According to recent figures, the total area reforested between 1906 and 2004 lies somewhere between 1.05 million ha (FAO data) and 1.09 million ha (RFD, 1998; 2004; Green World Foundation, 1999).

120. Thailand's forests are also important global repositories of carbon. Thailand's Second (2010) National Communication to the UNFCCC states that the country's main options to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions include land use change and the forest sector. The forest sector became a net sink of CO2 in 2000 and government estimates of carbon stocks in living biomass are 881 million metric tonnes. Therefore, carbon sequestration through sustainable forest management in Thailand has the potential to play a significant role in ameliorating global environmental problems.

121. Community management of natural resources has existed throughout the history of village settlements in Thailand. However, the recent development of a Community Forests (CF) concept was introduced to Thailand in the mid-1970s. In 2002 a Bill was passed by the House of Representatives that recognises the legal status of communities living in and around Thailand's National Forest Reserves to manage forest areas in collaboration with the Royal Forest Department but the Senate rejected key provisions and proposed amendments[11] which meant that the Bill falls short of inferring what might be regarded as any form of ownership on these

[3] https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/th.html

[4] World Bank, 2000. Thailand Environmental Monitor

[5] *Ibid*

[6] UNDP, Human Dverlopment Index Report, 2010

[7] *Ibid*

[8] http://www.un.or.th/services/socio-economic-situation/

[9] FAO, 2009

[10] FAO, 2010

[11] Salaam, MD, Abdus T Noguchi and Pothitan, R (2006) Community forest management in Thailand. Current situation and dynamics in the context of sustainable development. New Forest 31: 273-291.

communities. The 2007 Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand provides a basis for the community entitlement to co-manage the natural resources and environment in their areas.

2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

122. The Project Document states that the objective was to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up integrated Community Based Forestry and Catchment Management (CBFCM) practices through innovative financing mechanisms. To achieve this the project would strengthen systemic capacities in sustainable forest and catchment management at the local, regional, and national levels (Outcome 1), and support the expansion of CBFCM coverage throughout the country through pilot testing of defined Payment for Environmental Services (PES) and bio-carbon financing mechanisms (Outcome 2).
123. Therefore, the project would build capacities of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) to harmonize policies, plans and legal instruments to support CBFCM and PES and bio-carbon schemes. It would also support the establishment of a multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM, with active participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, Regional Environmental Offices (REOs), Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) and RFD. This would act as an effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing and capacity development mechanism. The project would also strengthen national capacities to promote PES (including and bio-carbon) in order to strengthen community incentives for effective forest and catchment management.
124. The project would support scaling up of CBFCM best practices using PES and bio-carbon financing mechanisms at four sites, led by four Regional Environment Offices (REOs). These sites include Mae Sa Catchment (North), Tha Chin Catchment (Central), Lam Sebai Catchment (Northeast), and Pa-Ngan Catchment (South). The project would strengthen capacities of local authorities, landholders and the private sector to ensure that innovative financing mechanisms (PES) are used for improving livelihoods, global biodiversity conservation benefits, and GHG emission reduction from land use and land use changes. In order to do this, the project would support catchment level ecosystem services valuation (including bio-carbon) and assessment of benefits, trade-offs and various opportunity costs of land-use options taking into full account the ecosystem services. Biodiversity friendly PES and bio-carbon financing strategies would be implemented, with institutionalization of payment distribution structures that fully consider gender and other social equity aspects.
125. The overall results of these interventions would be measured against a set of given indicators as given in the SRF.

2.4 Project implementation arrangements

126. The project was executed through UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the MONRE as the Implementing Partner (IP). Originally at the central level, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation under MONRE's Office of Permanent Secretary (OPS) was to serve as the focal point of the project and the project management unit (PMU). At the site level, Regional Environmental Offices (REO) are the focal points in each pilot site. REO 1 (Chiang Mai), leads the Northern cluster; REO 12 (Ubon Ratchathani) leads the North-eastern cluster; REO 5 (Nakhon Pathom), leads the Central cluster, and; REO 14 (Surat Thani) leads the Southern cluster.
127. However, following the PPG phase and drafting of the Project Document, there were significant government institutional changes to the project implementation arrangements. At the time of the project preparation, REO 5, and then the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (under OPS) had

been assigned as the project administrative focal point. At the time of the project signing, project administrative unit was shifted to the Office of Policy and Strategy. A few months after project implementation started, there was an internal restructuring within MONRE and all REOs were moved to be under the Pollution Control Department (PCD). Consequently, the project was moved to PCD with its Planning Analysis and Evaluation Division taking charge of the project management. Shortly after the MTR, the REOs were transferred back to the OPS. The Project Management Unit was moved back to be under the OPS and the Director of the Office of Policy and Strategy was appointed as the Project Director.

2.5 Main stakeholders

128. As per the Project Document, the stakeholder assessment lists the following groups of stakeholders:
    - Households and communities (service providers)
    - Intermediaries: Agencies contributing to promoting, establishing, or strengthening the link between Services Providers and Buyers; Technical Back stoppers; Public sector agencies
        - Public agencies that have management authority over the ecosystems of the PES sites:
        - Public agencies that have functional responsibilities related to natural resources such as:
        - Public sector financial institutions (Bank of Agriculture and Agricultural Cooperatives; the Krung Thai Bank).
        - International agencies
        - NGOs
129. Buyers of ecosystem services: Private Sector businesses who benefit directly from ecosystems services; Private Sector businesses interested in being involved as part of the CSR activities; General public (both international and domestic) who sees the importance of ecosystems service and willing to make private contributions.
130. The stakeholder analysis defined stakeholders in terms of: **households and communities** (service providers; and later deemed as the "*sellers*" of ecosystem services); **intermediaries** (more than twelve), and, **buyers of ecosystem services** (with three subdivisions).
131. In the stakeholder analysis, communities were not distinguished but rather grouped into one single group. From the perspective of PES and bio-carbon financing, communities would have to have specific contractual arrangements and obligations. Whereas intermediaries and "buyers" (of ecosystem services) were subdivided into well-defined groups. As also pointed out in the MTR, there were more than twelve intermediaries, considering "... that the Project Document stated that "*based on the institutional context and the policy entry points mentioned above, the adoption and implementation of PES and bio-carbon mechanism will require engagement of the following stakeholders*"

2.6 Expected Results

132. The **objective** of the project was: To create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up of integrated community-based forest and catchment management (CBFCM) practices through harnessing of innovative financing mechanisms in Thailand.

133. The Project Document sets out a strategy based on two outcomes. The first **Outcome** addresses the national regulatory framework in order to develop an enabling environment supportive of both community-based forest and catchment management and the use of innovative market-based financing mechanisms such as PES and bio-carbon. It is stated as: ***Strengthened policy environment and systemic capacities to promote sustainable community-based forest and catchment management through PES and bio-carbon financing mechanisms***.
134. The **second Outcome** intends to use the revenues from these innovative financing mechanisms to provide the motivation for developing CBFCM at four pilot sites. It is written as: ***Expanded CBFCM coverage through pilot testing and up-scaling of best practice using PES and bio-carbon financing schemes and mechanisms***.
135. Both the enabling environment and the development of operational (and PES or bio-carbon financed) CBFCM was to be supported by technical advice and capacity building.
136. The ProDoc identified the following barriers to developing this: ***a weak policy environment and systemic capacities to support community involvement in conservation and management of forests and catchments*** and ***the limited capacities and incentives for the sustainable management of forests and catchments***.

3 Findings of the TE

3.1 Project Design and Formulation

137. The Project Document is the principle strategy document for a UNDP-supported GEF-financed project intervention, cf. Section 3.1.1 for a critical analysis thereof, including assumptions and risks anticipated at the start of the project.

3.1.1 Project design

138. The thorough evaluation of the project design, by the MTR, is largely accepted by the TE. Innovation of financing mechanisms for ecosystem goods and services is in itself a complex subject, and combining it with another complex subject, viz. developing community-based natural resource management (CBFCM) would almost inevitably be challenging.
139. The ProDoc provides a description of the historic and recent experiences of community-based forest management in Thailand, though perhaps paints a rather overly positive picture of how well this has performed. The level of capacity at both government level and certainly at the level of communities was varying from place to place, depending on combined factors such as community's genuine interest and collective commitment to protect their forests and natural resources as well as enabling policy framework, rules and regulations in support of the community-based forest management. The ET concurs with the MTR's concerns about the definitions of certain terms used in the ProDoc. For example, where it was stated: "communities" were expected to "*enter into contractual agreement which specifies the activities (services) they are required to perform in return for compensation or reward*"[12], the definition of "*community*" should have reflected the existing social arrangements, geographical delineation, and with a defined membership. The broad definitions applied is in stark contrast to the national inventory conducted by the RFD in 1992[13] which documented twelve thousand rural groups protecting forest patches, ranging in size from one to four thousand hectares".

[12] Project Document p. 25

[13] Asia Forest Network, Community Forests in Thailand: http://www.asiaforestnetwork.org/tha.htm

140. It is also noted that the ProDoc does not contain a working definition of neither community based forest and catchment management, nor of PES, in the specific context of this project. It should be noted that the definition of Community Forest under the Community Forest Management Bill (2002) cannot be applied in this project. And PES can be defined in different ways, very broad including ecosystem provisioning goods (e.g. timber, meat, fibre, etc.) and services, or, in more restricted as only services (such as water quality/quantity, pollination, carbon sequestration, etc.). The lack of a common understanding of these key concepts of the project has had a substantial negative impact on project implementation throughout the project lifetime, perhaps particularly so at the REO/pilot level.
141. The ET feels that there was some merit in terms of the geographical spread of the sites and the relative locations of the sites on a continuum from mountain ridge to the sea coast (Mae Sa being the most upstream location, and Tha Chin being the most downstream location., and the island ecosystem of Koh Pha-Ngan). However, it may have been more appropriate and effective to choose fewer sites, considering the complexities of the project, including coordination, logistics, oversight, etc.
142. The design of the PMU in the ProDoc has contributed to the difficulties. The technical assistance to the PMU covered resource economics and policy aspects but they did not have any specific community resource management expertise. In addition, the technical assistance was outsourced to external consultants, whose work may not have been as integrated into the overall work/strategy than if they had been internal members of the PMU team.
143. The strong recommendation by the MTR to recruit a Chief Technical Advisor (to report to the Project Director), considering the project's innovative and complex nature (natural resource economics and community-based management), was not followed, in part due to the difficulty of finding an international candidate with experience on both community-based natural resource management and natural resource economics.
144. At the time of developing the ProDoc, it was anticipated that bio-carbon would become an important source of revenues and potentially could provide an important incentive for effective CBFCM. Confounding the project efforts, the bio-carbon financing schemes would be dependent upon favourable bio-carbon prices on the voluntary market. But the price of carbon remained too low, and the cost of entry too high, for the bio-carbon market to ever become attractive and take off. These issues were becoming clearer around the time of the ProDoc development (e.g., World Bank Carbon Finance Unit, 2011[14]). Further, the costs of compliance were often prohibitive.
145. Given that none of the novel concepts and approaches (PES, bio-carbon financing schemes) being introduced through the ProDoc had previously been tested in Thailand, the project design overestimated the national capacities to cost account for ecosystem goods and services, develop innovative financing mechanisms for the ecosystem, and develop community-based natural resource management systems.
146. In summary the project was taking on a very large challenge, both of a technical and an adaptive nature. Many aspects of the project strategy required capacities and skills (institutional and individual) to be put in place by the project before solutions could be developed. Leaving aside any merits of the strategy, a four-year timeframe was overambitious.

[14] Bio-carbon Fund Experience. Insights from Afforestation and Reforestation Clean Development mechanism Projects. World Bank Carbon Finance Unit, Washington, DC, December 2011.

3.1.2 Strategic Results Framework (Logframe)

147. The MTR provided a good detailed analysis of the SRF/logframe, and this is summarised here. The SRF is the central monitoring and evaluation tool in GEF-funded project. It sets out a coherent strategy for a project intervention and a means to monitor the progress and compare the predicted course of the project with what happens once implementation begins in order to ensure that the project remains on track, as well as to determine whether assumptions made during the project's design, prove to be correct. This is therefore the tool for adaptively managing the project, by iteratively comparing the real impact of a project intervention with the predicted effect and making any necessary adjustments if necessary, as well as re-evaluating the set of indicators and targets.

148. The SRF also describes the mutually agreed outputs and outcomes for the project, against which the project will be judged by the GEF, in terms of evaluation of whether the project performed according to the agreement of the GEF grant.

149. The CBFCM project SRF had several weaknesses, including wordings of indicators/targets, some project design issues. Weaknesses analysed by the MTR and reinforced by the ET include the following.

- **Poor fit between the project's expectations and the reasonable expectations of a project of this size and duration:** The indicators selected and the targets (for outcome 2) suggest that the project design did not clearly understand the complexity and the scale of this outcome. Alternatively, it may have understood the challenge but when it came to developing the SRF the indicators and targets should then have been more modest to demonstrate waypoints along a much lengthier process which would continue beyond the closure of the GEF-funded project. This was not the case and the SRF for outcome 2 is unlikely to accurately (and fairly) reflect the achievements of the REOs and the project *per se* at the pilot site level.
- **A lack of any coherent definition of CBFCM:** The outcome describes the expansion of CBFCM (to be driven by PES and bio-carbon financing), however, it does not set out in detail what CBFCM is. The Project Document identifies the lack of a clear policy framework for CBFCM as a barrier and notes that the Community Forest Management Bill was rejected by Parliament in 2002 and therefore the legitimacy of CBFCM relies mainly on the Tambon Administration Organization (TAO) Act (1994) which calls for the role of village governments in forest use, planning and decision making but this is still less than adequate for community-based natural resource management on the scale where PES and bio-carbon financing revenues can be effectively channelled through a contractual agreement (indicator 2.1 and 2.2 and with implications for 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6)[15]. UNDP in a response to the first draft suggested that while the community forest bill was pending, local communities can still have the rights to management of their own natural resources according to the Constitution therefore the project takes this as an entry point. "Local community" can be any group which is registered as a legal entity, or it can also be local government[16]. While the official definition and role of local government in natural resource management is clear, there is a need to establish a clearer definition of "community" especially where it relates to a common property resource.

[15] There are a number of initiatives to develop indicators for monitoring and evaluating BBFCM or the more commonly used community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), see Annex 6.

[16] UNDP response to first draft MTR

- **The use of biological indicators in a project:** The measurement of change in biological indicators is unlikely to be detectable in a project timeframe and even if change takes place would be spurious to correlate this with a project intervention. It is more reasonable to develop proxy indicators to measure a project's impact. The Threat Reduction Assessment tool[17] (TRA) which measures the reduction of threats to biodiversity (or natural values and processes) as *proxy* indicators and provides an *index* figure which can be contrasted over time is a useful and adaptable tool for this purpose.
- **A lack of any measure of the quality and effectiveness of CBFCM:** Few *process* indicators were used in the SRF which either describe a successful community-based management system or measure the effectiveness and functional efficiency of such a system. Qualitative and process-oriented indicators would be critical for this project. The indicator assumed that "*there will be transparent and reliable correlation that can be drawn between livelihood quality and PES/bio-carbon schemes per project site*". The baseline for this indicator was poorly defined/described and did not provide a measurable unit.
- **The wording of some indicators is confusing:** Clarity in phrasing an indicator is critical to its utility as both a measure of effectiveness and a means to judge performance. For instance, indicator 2.1 states "*the Number and Type[41] of PES and bio-carbon financing schemes developed…*". The target for the same indicator reads "*at least four PES and bio-carbon financing schemes (one for each REO site)*". Bio-carbon scheme is effectively a PES, and different *types* of PES or at least different ecosystems are not distinguished. It is not clear whether this means four schemes (one for each REO), eight schemes (PES and bio-carbon in each REO), different types of PES schemes, and a bio-carbon scheme in each REO, etc. Similarly, indicator 2.2 includes both the area under CBFCM and PES schemes but only provides a target for CBFCM (15,000 ha).
- **There are differences between the English and the Thai versions of the SRF:** Indicator 2.2 has a target of 15,000 ha "*under community management*" which was erroneously interpreted/translated as an increase or addition of 15,000 ha of new forest (i.e. new afforestation) in the Thai translation, perhaps because the indicator is ambiguous. This was corrected in the Inception Report, but was apparently still an issue during the MTR. The ET, however, did not encounter this as an issue.
- **A number of indicators, and in particular the targets, were deemed unattainable within a four-year project period:** Indicators and targets were very ambitious, and it was difficult both to collect the data and to correlate changes with project interventions, considering the short timescale.

150. The SRF was not designed as a logical hierarchy of activities leading to outputs, outputs to outcomes and subsequently these outcomes achieving an objective, or bringing about a significant change in the circumstances leading to, in this case, improved ecosystem management and resilience of both local communities and the ecosystem goods and services which society *per se* depends upon. Unfortunately, the two components (the outcomes) did not form a coherent strategy which would be creating an enabling environment for the introduction of innovative mechanism to catalyse appropriate ecosystem management and community-based management.

[17] *Is Our Project Succeeding? A Guide to Threat Reduction Assessment for Conservation*. Richard Margoluis and Nick Salafsky, Biodiversity Support Programme, Washington DC [41] Capitalisation is in the Project Document SRF.

151. The MTR proposed some changes in the way indicators and the targets were expressed/interpreted, thereby being better able to measure achievements. No concrete action was made on this but there was internal discussion to clarify some of the confusing issues regarding the SRF, for example ensuring consistency between the English and Thai translation of the SRF.

3.1.3 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, &, Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

152. During the project design phase, consultations with a few government and donor projects aiming to promote sustainable community-based natural resource management and innovative financing mechanism also took place as explained below. Linkages between the project and these interventions have also been identified in the project design.
153. Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO) established in 2007 to implement solutions to major issues facing biodiversity conservation. It was given the mandate of promoting conservation of biodiversity, improving local community knowledge of best practice for biodiversity friendly and enhancing biodiversity based economy development. In its five-year strategic plan (2007-2011), BEDO has considered the adoption of Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) concept to enable its work on developing sustainable production of biodiversity-based products. During 2011-2015, BEDO was granted GEF/UNDP project: Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape (SMBT) 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. The Community-based social enterprise concept was applied whereby communities using forest resources for their enterprise development payback a certain percentage of their interest back to conservation fund. Lessons learnt from the project will inform inclusion of PES application on BEDO's next five- year strategic plan (2012-2017)
154. UNDP-supported GEF-financed Full-sized Project: "Catalyzing sustainability of the PA system" (2010-2014) by the Department of Nationl Park Wildlife and Plants Conservation (DNP). The project aims to overcome barriers to effective management and sustained financing of Thailand's protected area system. PES concept is applied to establish protected area conservation fund in all pilot sites.
155. ECO-BEST project (2012-2015) funded by EU and GIZ and implemented by DNP focuses on economics and financial tools to enhance nature conservation.
156. Linkages with these projects as well as a few other interventions in this similar focal area is provided under Output 1.2 of the project: **Functional multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM (with participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, REOs, ONEP and RFD) that facilitates effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing, self-capacity development and access to PES and bio-carbon**. Under this output, it is expected that the project will engage stakeholders from similar interventions and various government agencies in open dialogues with a focus on the use of economic instruments to act as forest and catchment management incentives. At a later stage, this multi-sectoral committee will be included under the National Environment Board with policy feedback function.

3.1.4 Stakeholder engagement

157. The nature of the CBFCM project with its national policy component (outcome 1) and the pilot operational sites (outcome 2) makes it necessary to engage high-level stakeholders at one end for the policy reform process and to engage a much larger and disparate group of stakeholders at the pilot site.

158. The Project Document's stakeholder analysis and engagement plan was briefly discussed in Section 2.6 and the issue of "lumping" the local community into one bracket was noted. The PPG carried out a Capacity Assessment Scorecard for the REOs to assess their capabilities to lead the community-based components of the project. This identified a number of weaknesses and to be fair there were strong elements of capacity building built into the project. However, this did not restrain the expectations of what might be achieved and the speed with which change could occur. In the event the REOs, including the Field Coordinators, have done remarkably well to get to where they are now. The project has recognised that additional resources were needed here, albeit late in the day. RECOFTC was brought in to reinforce this area of the project but it has had mixed results, with greater success in some REOs (REO 1and 12) than others (REO 5 and 14). In REO 14 this is probably due to their "late arrival" in the project and the difficulties specific to this REO (i.e. there were no forest communities to work with, tourism is the largest issue, the coastal area and the reef system are of greater environmental concern than forest areas, etc.). In REO 5 it is less clear why RECOFTC has been less successful and possibly due to the REO having done a lot of groundwork before RECOFTC was brought in. Regardless it demonstrates the project employing adaptive management to try and strengthen the stakeholder engagement at this level.

159. There is apparently demonstrated support for the project's objectives by the stakeholders, although both the MTR and this ET is not convinced that these objectives have been fully understood by all the stakeholders. The REOs were faced with resistance and reluctance from some stakeholders in the beginning , but the REOs generally seem to have overcome this and performed well.

160. The project experienced an increasing engagement of local government and agencies, private sector and the communities. The active engagement of the many stakeholders is challenging but critical for collective management of ecosystem resources. This is particularly pronounced in REO 1 with an emerging catchment-wide engagement of stakeholders from local communities, private business, and local governments and line agencies, resulting in – evidently - increased quantity and improved quality of water in the target catchment, with some replication effect to other watersheds on voluntary basis. This has led to the establishment of a major PES-like scheme for water provision services. REO 5 also demonstrated strong commitment on the part of local communities and local governments, who formed themselves into community networks to offer PES-like services in three broad areas, i.e. mangrove rehabilitation, water quality inspection, and awareness raising/knowledge dissemination on sustainable natural resource management.

161. REO 12 performed well, was very focused and benefited from the most discrete community in terms of "ownership" of the forest. Although the project has not focused to build PES schemes through the existing structure of community forest committee, it has further enhanced its capability through introduction of PES and bio-carbon schemes. In particular, it introduces the forest committee to new technical conservation knowledge (e.g. economic valuation of the forest, monitoring carbon absorption capacity of trees in the forest). This is perceived by local government (TAO) as a value-added to their services to the communities as TAO has no environmental specialist.

162. The forest is a small part of a larger ecosystem and catchment area. In one way, the communities themselves have benefited from the well-protected forest from which they collect their food and small non-timber forest products. Additionally, the REO was able to mobilise external support from private sector to improve community's livelihoods and to reduce their farming costs.
Although these private businesses are not direct beneficiaries of the CBFCM services, there is a potential in the future to establish PES arrangements between the communities and facories for carbon offsets from the forest.

163. In all three cases stakeholder engagement has been helped by aligning the project's objectives with those of the stakeholders: hence, in REO 1, the focus on water quality and quantity was important to increase the level of engagement whereas in REO 5, common concerns on mangrove rehabilitation and improved water quality in public canal have brought a wide range of multi-sectoral stakeholders together to collectively address the issues.

164. REO 14 has had the most challenging time in engaging stakeholders. Pha-Ngan watershed was selected to represent an island ecosystem which covers both watershed forest and coastal areas. In the beginning it was not easy to engage with communities, especially in upstream area as the watershed forest is under preparation stage to become 'Protected Area' where no activities by communities are allowed. This challenge has been realised and discussed since the inception phase and much of adaptive management has been made to accommodate how REO can find the right hook to engage with communities. It was agreed (among PMU, REO 14, technical advisors, and UNDP) that REO 14 could focus on water quality/ crab banks/ coral rehabilitation while making some links with upstream communities (organic coconut growers) in the forest buffer zones. Towards the end of the project, a series of conservation activities have been implemented with engagement of fisherfolk communities and local businessed, including coral reef rehabilitation, crab banks, water quality check and mangrove rehabilitation. Multi-stakeholder network "Friends of Pha-Ngan" has been set up with members from community groups, private sectors, academis, and local government agencies. Sustainable Pha-Ngan Development plan covering different thematic areas has been developed and partially implemented. MOUs were signed between coastal communities and local agencies, hotel association, entrepreneur association in Rin beach, and a local shop-Nirah bakery. Through the "Friends of Pha-Ngan Network", midstream and upland communities have gradually been engaged in some conservation activities.

165. The cases of REO 14 (as well as the other REOs) reflect that the entry point could change according to circumstances and emerging issues of community needs and interests. This is fundamental to build a community PES scheme. Hence, the project needs to put in adaptive management measures to maintain the balance between what is committed in the prodoc, and the changes on the ground.

166. The policy dialogues appear to be working well for a broad cross-section of the stakeholders. Stakeholder engagement must be incremental and iterative, perhaps particularly on complex and innovative issues such as PES and bio-carbon.

167. There have been positive experiences in terms of creating platforms for dialogue to reach out to multiple and interdepartmental institutional stakeholders. For example, at the national level, , the initial policy dialogue was organised by the Deputy Director General of the PCD and encompassed many key agencies working on PES and bio-carbon under the MONRE, including representatives from the Department of Marine and Coastal Resource (DMCR), Department of Water Resources (DWR), Royal Forest Department (RFD), Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plants Conservation (DNP), Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP), OPS, and Biodiversity - Based Economy Development Office (BEDO). Applying

these dialogues to develop policy instruments on PES and CBFCM still poses challenges. The ET finds that these dialogues/forums are still ad-hoc and presumes that this ad-hoc group would form the basis of the multi-sectoral mechanism to be attached to the National Environment Committee to facilitate effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing, etc. after the project closure. Its composition should be expanded to include representatives from regional and local levels with gronded PES experience.

3.1.5 Replication Approach

168. The project design did not make specific reference to the intended approach for replicating the project's results, achievement and experiences.
169. There were limited efforts to upscale and replicate approaches and results on a wider schale, primarily due to delays in overall project implementation, therefore not allowing time for replication/upscaling, and due to the resulting lack of progress/result.
170. However, the project did achieve some significant upscaling/replication in individual pilot sites, particularly at Mae Sa, and with significant potential at Tha Chin.

3.1.6 UNDP's comparative advantage

171. Overall, UNDP has the potential, capacity and network to draw on international best practice in the areas of both community-based forest and catchment management, as well as in the complex and evolving areas of PES and bio-carbon schemes. The network includes other UN agencies, other intergovernmental organisations, international and national non-governmental organisations, as well as links to private sector networks, including through the UN Global Compact, etc. UNDP is also an important partner of ASEAN.
172. UNDP has been assisting the Kingdom of Thailand in implementing a number of global environmental conventions including the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). This project intended to assist the Thai Government in meeting its obligations under these conventions and developing synergies between different conventions. UNDP Thailand's Environment Portfolio supports the Royal Thai Government in using PES and other environmental financing approaches as incentives for biodiversity conservation and GHG emission reduction.
173. Besides the present project, UNDP was also a key player in introducing the PES concept in Thailand via three projects under GEF-4 portfolio: Sustainable Financing of Protected Area, Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's PA system' (CATSPA); and Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape.
174. In addition, UNDP worked with the Ministry of Interior under the Joint UNDP-UNEP 'Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI),' supporting the process of environmental valuation as a tool for mainstreaming of environmental conservation and sustainable resource use into development planning at all levels. Furthermore, UNDP is experienced in administering Small Grants Programmes under GEF, EU- Tropical Forest Small Grants, and Mangroves for the Future (MFF), which are focusing on strengthening community networks in natural resources and environmental management in key ecosystems.
175. The TE notes that the role of the UNDP (and other multi-lateral and bilateral organisations) may have changed since Thailand's transition from being considered a developing country to becoming an upper middle-income country. Its comparative adventage is shifted from being a financial donor towards a development partner to assist the country in achieving its commitments

to global /international development goals and protocols through testing of new ideas and strategies which could be further replicated and upscaled by the country.

3.1.7 Management arrangements

176. As the Implementing Partner (IP), the responsibilities of MONRE included:
    - Coordinating activities to ensure the delivery of agreed outcomes;
    - Certifying expenditures in line with approved budgets and work-plans;
    - Facilitating, monitoring and reporting on the procurement of inputs and delivery of outputs;
    - Coordinating interventions financed by GEF/UNDP with other parallel interventions;
    - Preparation of Terms of Reference for consultants and approval of tender documents for sub-contracted inputs, and;
    - Reporting to UNDP on project delivery and impact.
177. The decision to work directly with REOs was consistent with their mandate to work with international projects, and the ET indeed finds that REOs were the appropriate agencies for project implementation
178. However, in hindsight, it should perhaps have been recognised that REOs have minimal mandate and capacity to deal with catchment and land management, and the project therefore should have put additional emphasis on the systematic capacity building of REOs.
179. The challenges posed by the change back to the OPS (from the previous change to the PCD from the OPS) was due to the move of REOs under MONRE's restructuring, and as such was unavoidable and beyond the control of the project. It certainly caused substantial delays and bureaucratic issues. It also affects the willingness to understand and drive the project as well as the commitment and the ownership at management level of MONRE while the commitment at the REO levels remain strong throughout.
180. The overall advantages of the NIM modality was described in the MTR, and includes "embedding the project experience within the institutional framework and it provides a firm basis for ownership of the project". However, there is a risk embedding the PMU within governmental structures as it could slow decision-making processes (due to the cautious approaches and bureaucratic procedures) to a degree which is incompatible with innovative projects like this one which is limited by funding period and inherent need to take risks. The ET also notes that the changes in MONRE institutional structure which resulted in the project being moved back to the PS office after the MTR has further slowed down implementation. It took quite some time for OPS to reset the management, administrative and financial systems to support project implementation. At times when there were short of staff allocated from MONRE, the PM had to handle both management and administrative work by herself. The cautious approaches and bureaucratic procedures still continued after the shift of project management unit from PCD to OPS.
181. With a short-time available after the MTR to the project closure, it would have been more effective and useful if the Project Board would meet regularly to discuss adaptive management, strategy and workplans and to provide the PMU with timely decision on critical management issues. The ET was informed that since the MTR – the Project Board has met only once, by all accounts not reconcilable with the serious problems faced by the project.
182. The ET finds that REOs generally performed well, considering the changes in focus towards waste management, and considering the additional work load from the project to their normal work schedule. No REOs seemed to have dedicated fulltime staff to the CBFCM project, although some

of the staff indicated that they spent more than 50% of their time working on the project. Some even stated that they worked on weekends on project activities, especially with the communities. Although the project employed Field Coordinators attached to REOs to assist in coordinating work with communities and on financial procedures, the substantive part of project work is still under REO staff's responsibilities. Given the amount and innovative nature of the project work, it should be reflected in the individual Key Performance Indicators (KPI) of the project staff, leading to a high degree of ownership by the REOs.

183. The way in which the technical assistance was used appears to have lacked coherence and strategic direction. This reflected a bigger issue, namely that the project lacked overall cohesion between the various field-based implementers, policy level technocrats and the other stakeholders. There should be a mechanism to ensure that experiences from the local pilot site level inform national policy making and development at MONRE.
184. There was optimism in the MTR that the recommended extension of the project would allow the project to capitalise on several achievements and ensure substantial delivery of additional achievements despite the short span available. The MTR also noted that this was contingent upon more speedy and effective project management, by both the PMU at MONRE and by UNDP in terms of consultant recruitment, etc. Unfortunately, two unexpected events caused additional delay and have had substantial effect on project delivery.
185. First, the move of PMU back to OPS caused both additional delay and apparently less seamless project management. The latter might be exacerbated by unclear relationship and roles between members of the PMU.
186. Second, a financial/accounting irregularity was the direct cause of a six-months delay/suspension of all activities. This risked having a detrimental impact on the project, both in terms of negative impact on the already slow progress and momentum that was beginning to be felt at the time of the MTR. This caused an almost frantic need to execute as many of the outstanding activities before project closure.
187. Therefore, before official closure, a very substantial effort is necessary to secure the sustainability of the modest achievements of the project.

3.1.8 Communications

188. Effective adaptive management depends on good communication. For a project with a dispersed set of sites, and with complex and innovative ideas and concepts, both internal and external communication would be important. It is important to distinguish between distribution of information, and, actually communicating with each other. The latter implies dialogues, feedback and discussions.
189. There have been reasonable internal communications in the project, with regular meetings and feedback particularly between the PMU, REOs and UNDP who met quarterly during the first three years of the project under PCD. However, after the project was transferred to OPS, the meetings did not take place regularly and systematically.
190. The concept of PES and CBFCM while still not fully comprehended by many stakeholders, is gaining some traction. There is a need for enhancing the general awareness on these key concepts among stakeholders. The ET finds that the REOs and the Field Coordinators have been effective in stakeholder communication. Through continual dialogues and discussion e.g. formal workshops, training, participatory planning, stakeholders gradually developed clearer understanding of CBFCM and PES.

191. The gradual familiarization with PES in various departments has enhanced, and the gradual inclusion of PES in national documents, has generally increased awareness and understanding.
192. There is gradually a wealth of reports, but it appears to have been challenging to communicate the results and implications of these in a systematic manner. The long delays have hampered the timely delivery of many of the studies. During the last quarter of the project, knowledge products and documentation of lessons learned have been developed but it is obviously too late to be useful for the CBFCM project itself. However, this documentation on concepts, methodologies, benefits, opportunities, etc., will be important for future work on PES and community-based forest and catchment management, including for dialogues with the private sector.

3.2 Project implementation

3.2.1 Adaptive management

193. This refers to the ability of the project to adjust and provide changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation.
194. The ET recognizes that the policy context can change rapidly since the time of project design to actual implementation phase, and that it can be difficult to fully anticipate such changes during the planning stage. For this reason, the ability to adapt becomes critical.
195. The ET concludes that the project has put efforts to adapt and react to changes in the implementation context both within the Project Management Unit and at the local levels (REO and at the pilot site level). However, it was with limited impact due to the combination of insufficient strategic technical supervision/guidance at PMU level and insufficient capacity and lack of /untimey technical guidance at field level.
196. The recommendation of the MTR, viz. engaging a CTA was not pursued/followed and the ET finds that the impact of this on both technical oversight and direction was substantial.
197. Further, the strong MTR recommendation that a working definition of PES should be developed and adopted across the project elements and pilot sites was also not followed.

3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements

198. The partners selected for the project, at both national and local levels, are deemed appropriate from the perspective of mandate and relevance to the subject matters. One of REOs' mandates on international coordination is to develop modality, tools, and mechanisms for sustainable environmental management. In this sense, REOs were strategically selected to be implementers of the project. However, it was noted that it can be difficult to secure full commitment by REO staff unless projects and their subject matter are considered as key part of the REO's overall KPI.
199. In hindsight, more effort should perhaps have been invested in the project preparation phase to ensure their active commitment (see also Country Ownership).

3.2.3 Feedback M&E Activities used for Adaptive Management

200. Overall, the ET finds that monitoring and evaluation with respect to both progress and impact were used to adjust project implementation to a certain degree, especially when the project was under PCD. PMU and UNDP held regular meetings to monitor/ discuss issues on implementation and find ways to improve them. PIR reports provided more comprehensive information on project progress linked to outputs and outcomes. However, some issues need immediate action while the PIR is prepared on an annual basis. Key recommendations of the MTR recommendations were not taken up and this has impact on the overall achievement of the project towards the end.

3.2.4 Finance and co-finance

201. The budget execution to April 2017 is 74% (US$ 1302946), compared to just forty-one per cent (US$736,976) in August 2015, of the total budget (US$1,756,182). There has been misunderstanding in terms of reporting co-financing. The figure at the time of writing the TE, is US$ 396.368,36, compared to the pledged US$ 12.210.000 (as per ProDoc), as the contribution of the Government of Thailand. The co-financing costs have been entirely in-kind for items such as salaries of PCD/OPS/REO government officials involved in the project, senior project management, utilities (electricity, water, etc.), office space for the PMU and transportation.
202. The leveraged co-financing includes crab banks and artificial reefs in REO-14, the construction of weirs at Mae Sa, the grant provided by SCCG to kick of conservation activities in 4 pilot sites, etc.
203. Co-financing from UNDP for CBFCM budget includes project level cash contribution from the UNDP project "Biodiversity Finance Initiative" (BIOFIN) of US$ 54,882 during the period of three years from late October 2014 till the end of 2017. This first phase of the project aims to implement alternative financing mechanisms including Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES). Under the same project, an in-kind support around USD 8,800.50 from a company. Therefore, the total co-financing amount mobilized from UNDP side is USD 63,682.50.

3.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

204. The MTR discussed extensively the appropriateness of the selected set of indicators, and basically most of those arguments remain valid. In summary, the MTR pointed out that the CBFCM project SRF had a number of weaknesses some of which were related to the phrasing and statement of indicators and targets and some of which were related to the project's design which was extremely overambitious in what it was attempting to accomplish in four years. This is reflected in the choice of indicators but more importantly the setting of targets. These weaknesses, in particular as related to Outcome 2 included (i) poor fit between the project's expectations and the reasonable expectations of a project of this size and duration; (ii) a lack of any coherent definition of CBFCM; (iii) the use of biological indicators which is unlikely to be detectable within the project timeframe; (iv) a lack of process indicators to measure quality and effectiveness of CBFCM; confusing wording of some indicators; (v) differences in the English and Thai versions of the indicators; and (vi) a number of the indicators, and in particular the targets are unattainable within a four-year project period.
205. The ET finds that the project has made efforts to address some of these weaknesses after the MTR. English and Thai versions of the SRF were revisited to ensure alignment. Efforts to reach common agreement on the definition of CBFCM were initiated although with limited contribution to the project achievement as it took place at a very late stage of project implementation. No clear efforts were made to address other weaknesses addressed by the MTR. Hence, the SRF's function to determine whether assumptions made during the project's design is correct in light of experience was not well taken and opportunity for adaptive management was missed, particularly in developing process indicators to assess gradual changes taking place throughout the process of linking CBFCM to PES. As understood, the process engages capacity building in various aspects, e.g. economic valuations of natural resources, community mobilisation and organization, sustainable forest and catchment management, as well as negotiation and stakeholder engagement skills. These capacities are building blocks leading to effective CBFCM-

PES scheme in the longer-run. Hence, changes along the way should be accounted especially for the project with ambitious targets within limited timeframe.

206. The M&E plan was implemented with limited capacity. As there was big time lapse from the project design phase to the actual start of the project, baseline data needed to be updated and there were delays in this process, as well as process of collecting data to monitor changes along the way. The project teams especially in REOs find that data collecting and updating according to the indicated benchmarks is a time consuming and complicated process, requiring special expertise and extra budget. Project Implementation Review (PIR) was conducted annually but with long delays and in most cases lack of verified data sources to support the reporting and judgement of the ratings.

3.2.6. Project Execution

3.2.6.1 Implementing Agency (UNDP)

207. UNDP has played influential role in project execution, especially in crtical situation. When the project was moved from PS office to PCD, it was initially reluctant to accept the role on project administration as its priority mandate is on brown issues. Through a series of consultation, UNDP has encouraged PCD to see the value that PES schemes would add to its mandate as another economic tool for sustainable environmental management in addition to the Pollutor Pays Principle as already adopted by PCD.
208. During the first half of the project UNDP had regular and systematic meetings with PCD and PMU to monitor implementation progress and tackle emerging issues. UNDP's participation in important field events, e.g. in stakeholders meeting to identify potential PES opportunity was also evident.
209. After the MTR, the role of UNDP continued with OPS but with less degree of influence due to difference in administration arrangement and management approach withnin OPS. Informal meetings between UNDP and PMU took place often to address emerging administrative as well as technical issues. UNDP-attached portfolio coordinator was assigned to help PMU and OPS improve some of these issues. Despite all these good attempts, UNDP could have provided tighter oversight to PMU especially on accounting/book keeping.
210. UNDP's focus on project results was reflected through its strict application of the rule that the project must spend up to 80% of the advanced budget before the new request could be made. The purpose is to prompt the project to make efforts to make a realistic and effective result-based planning and implementation, not just to copy and paste the same activities in the work plan every year without any thought put on what needs to done and what the actual expenditures will be.

211. To reduce risks associated with frequent changes of project focal point, UNDP has engaged a coordinator to provide coaching to PMU and MONRE staff assigned to the project on result-based monitoring and reporting.

Implementing Agency (UNDP): Satisfactory (S)

3.2.6.2 Executing Agency (MONRE)

212. Frequent moves of REOs/PMU within MONRE (five times from the project formulation phase until the project end) has unavoidable impact on the continuity and effectiveness of project implementation. Each time that the project was moved, the process to explain the concept of the project, the management set-up, and financial arrangement had to start all over again. The level of commitment varied between different administrative units. There has not been sufficient attention from MONRE to set up an internal support system to ensure smooth continuity of the project despite the change in administration, as well as the willingness to address financial and operational complication of the project.

213. The frequent changes of the project focal point without a thorough thought how it would affect the overall achievement of the project objective also reflected insufficient focus of the EA on result-based implementation. It also appears that MONRE has not set up mechanism to properly manage risks associated with frequent changes in project focal points and frequent staff turnovers. PMU was left to handle both administrative and technical tasks resulting from these changes without sufficient and timely support from EA.

214. REOs have done reasonable job despite these frequent changes. In all cases, a number of REO staff are assigned and committed to implement the project although not on a fulltime basis. Some staff spent extra hours on weekends on the project activities with the communities.

Implementing Partner (MONRE): Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

3.2.6.3 Overall Project Execution

215. Overall project execution is moderately satisfactory, given the confusion and uncertainly about the project set-up at national level.

Overall Execution: Moderately Satisfacotry (MS)

3.2.6.4 Coordination and Operational issues

216. The ET supports the view of the MTR that strategic management approach is necessary for GEF-funded projects and that the PMU should be able to adaptively manage and steer the project, rather than merely being an administrative office. The MTR recommended the project to engage a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) to allow a strategic consolidation of technical support and to ensure development of relevant and targeted TORs, decision of timely delivery, etc. However, this recommendation was not followed. In the absence of the CTA, the Project Manager was expected to fulfil a role of both managing a project as well as providing overall technical oversight and direction, which is almost impossible. This has led to the lack of clear and coherent direction to guide field level interventions and the delay in key deliverables in both Outcomes.

217. In terms of understanding PES, there is still substantial confusion on the definition of PES. The MTR recommended that the project convene a workshop among stakeholders to commonly agree on the working definition of PES and then readjust the project's basic strategy, and remaining work plans, and activities to align to the clearer PES definition. The ET did not find that appropriate adjustments on both the definition and workplan had been made. The technical training course on PES as an economic instrument for sustainable resource management was conducted at a very late stage of the project for REO staff. Hence, it has not contributed to the alignment of the concept across the project partners in due time

218. The crucial role of the Project Board (PB) has not been fulfilled. PB did not meet regularly and the Chairmanship has been switched back and forth between OPS and PCD. So, its role as a continual forum for making important project-related decisions which should enable the project to adapt and respond to changes in due course has not been effective.

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Overall results

219. Overall, the project objective to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling up of integrated community-based forest and catchment management practice through harnessing of innovative financing mechanism has been partially achieved. Despite the extended project duration by 18 months after the MTR, the project still had difficulty in achieving intended results in due time due to the 6-month suspension of project implementation following the financial audit in 2015. In the final year of the project, advances were made on Outcomes 1 and 2 but some of the planned outputs had not been fully and effectively achieved.

220. Under Outcome 1, PES concept has been included in the National Environment Quality Plan (2017-2022). To materialize the concept MONRE's Permanent Secretary expressed that all 16 REOs incorporate PES in their natural resource management plans. A consultant was engaged to conduct training workshop for REO staff on PES and economic tools for natural resource management to equip them with necessary knowledge for the planning. The four REOs in demonstration sites have increased understanding about PES and hands-on experience in community engagement but no training centers have been set up at these REOs to serve as knowledge-hub on PES and biocarbon financing schemes.

221. PES policy communication within MONRE was done through the Project Board which comprises representatives from all concerned departments. However, multi-agency/multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM/PES dialogue, consultation and policy feedback has not been officially established/functional.

222. For Outcome 2, the project has supported a number of MOUs between local communities and private sector, government enterprises and government agencies to continue collaboration on and support to community-based forest and natural resource management. These MOUs are not PES contracts but they could well serve as foundation for future PES agreements should both parties can reach consensus on economic values of the ecosystem services provided and the willingness to pay by the private sector. Although there have not yet been full PES schemes, catchment areas under community-based management approach have already seen the benefit from financial and technical support from private sector as well as local government. In Mae Sa catchment, construction of 'living weirs' resulted in increased water flow throughout the year which benefits rice fields as well as eco-tourism-associated businesses in the catchment.

223. Although project objective has not been fully achieved, the increased understanding about PES concepts among project participants at both national and field level, the expressed interest of MONRE Permenent Secretatry to see PES integrated in natural resource management strategies of all REOs and the established MOU on CBFCM schemes between communities and private sector in the 4 pilot sites could serve as a springboard for future activities towards the project outcomes through existing working groups/ committee established to carry on the project initiatives after the project closure.

Overall Project Results: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

3.3.2 Progress towards outcome analysis

224. The MTR discussed the difficulties in assessing progress towards outcomes, specifically in relation to inefficiencies of the SRF. Furthermore, assumptions and risks were assessed rather optimistically, for example on CBFCM in Thailand and the required institutional capacities. The ET agrees with this assessment made by the MTR and makes further observations that the project workplans have not sufficiently and strategically covered activities that would contribute to the achievement of the outcomes. Meanwhile, there have been some additional changes which are not indicated in the existing SRF but worth noting. Most of these changes are process-related. The analysis of progress towards outcomes will reflect both.

3.3.2.1 Outcome 1

225. ***Strengthened policy environment and systemic capacities to promote sustainable community-based forest and catchment management through PES and bio-carbon financing mechanisms***:

226. Overall, there have been some/limited progress and achievements. As reported in the MTR, progress was initially slow but had increased in pace and most key elements (listed in the PIR 2015) were in place at the MTR. At the TE time, more have been done but there remain more wotk to be done after the project ends to achieve the intended outcome. The ET also acknowledges that formal changes in government administration procedures is time-consuming and does require patience. Policy-development is a lengthy process which needs substantial consultations and discussions, both within and among departments, at national, regional, and local levels. Formulation of legal framework will require much more time, well beyond the project's timeline. Some of the achievements made in Outputs 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 as described below could be building blocks for futher long-term policy and legal solutions.

227. **Output 1.1: Harmonized policies, plans and legal instruments to support CBFCM and PES and biocarbon schemes**

228. An Environmental Policy and Institutional Consultant was engaged to conduct an analysis to identify gaps and issues in relevant Acts and policies regarding PES and bio-carbon schemes. It was found that although PES was contained in the 11th National Plan, in the current 12th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2017-2022), the term PES has been removed and rather focus on economic tools, but there is limited or no reference to how these economic tools can be used in practice. However, the National Environment Quality Plan (2017-2022) does contain a PES conceptual framework, and the Regional Natural Resource and Environmental Management Strategies include PES, though the modality for practical application and implementation of PES does not appear obvious. A multi-sectoral consultative process to discuss the findings from the policy review and develop guidelines for the integration/harmonization of PES into existing policy has not systematically taken place. It was recommended by the Consultant that a separate unit within MONRE be established to continue and institutionalise the PES and bio-carbon efforts as a necessary precursor to further develop/harmonise the policies and legal measures. This unit could likely be picked up by the newly established Forest Resource and Land Office under MONRE's Office of National Reform and Reconciliation.

229. **Output 1.2: Functional multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM (with participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, REOs, ONEP and RED) that acilitates effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing, self capacity development and access to PES/biocarbon database.**

230. At the time of the TE, no such functional mechanism has been set up. Some dialogues were undertaken on an ad-hoc basis to share experiences on the implementation of PES, or PES-like projects and schemes by various agencies, including DNP, RFD, BEDO, PCD, etc. However, REOs

and communities were not adequately included in these dialogues. The idea to institutionalise this multi-sectoral mechanism under the National Environmenal Board to provide policy feedback on the use of economic instruments as incentives in forest and catchment management was not visited and materialised.

231. The database system work conducted by the Geographical Data Consultant is – at the time of writing – at long last under way. The ProDoc stated: "The database will provide a central collection point for PES/bio-carbon information, case studies and research studies. The regional offices will also be encouraged to develop similar databases for their regions." The ET feels that this effort should have received higher priority earlier during the project.
232. In addition, the ET observes that the database development does not appear as participatory as originally intended, and can seem lacking in focus. The actual applicability of the database is questionable – or at least not well defined, formalised and described. The way in which it will be integrated into the overall policy development process and framework also appears unclear.
233. The impression of the ET is that the database may be developing in the direction of a market place for announcing PES opportunities and where potential buyers and sellers can find each other. Such a "PES dating site" in itself would be an interesting and novel approach.

234. **Output 1.3 National capacity enhanced to promote incentive-based CBFCM**
235. This output has not been achieved to a substantial level, mainly because consultants have effectively been engaged only on an ad hoc basis to conduct specific economic valuations rather than based on a systemic approach to build capacity.
236. The intended national CBFCM coordinating agency/department within MONRE, to be responsible for the management of a CBFCM database and collection and dissemination of information, best practice, etc., had not been established at the time of writing the TE. As referred to above, a proposal to establish such a unit was anticipated and intended to be proposed to the Board before the project closure. However, it emerged during the debriefing of the TE to MONRE that – instead of setting up a separate unit for PES, MONRE Permanent Secretary has issued a Ministerial Order to establish MONRE-based Office to Mobilise National Reform, Strategy and Reconcilation. The Office will ensure that strategies and implementation of all departments/operational units under MONRE are consistent with the national reform and national reconciliation agenda in national resource management. The Office will include 4 operational units, i.e. Forest Resource and Land; Water Resource; Environment; and Administration. Chief of OPS, MONRE who has been assigned to direct the CBFCM project since the MTR is the chairman of the Forest and Land Unit under this Order. Hence, policies related to PES and other economic measures to motivate sustainable land use management are expected to be automatically included under the work of this Unit.
237. The ET finds that the project had not implemented systematic capacity building of REOs (particularly the four REOs directly involved in project implementation). In the early stage of the project, training on PES was conducted for REO staff at a conceptual level. Some REO staff also participated in PES workshop conducted by other projects (e.g. ECO-BEST). Given the complexity of the concept/methodologies and lack of clear working definition of PES for this project, REO staff and pilot communities struggled to apply the concept and gradually developed the 'to-be PES schemes' through a learning by doing process. Towards the end of the project (a bit too late), a team of consultant from NIDA was engaged to develop and conduct technical training on PES methodologies and economic instruments in natural resource management. The purpose was to build capacity of REO staff to become trainers on PES but it was not clear how possible that could

be as applying economic instruments requires in-depth understanding of economic concept while most of REO staff are environmental scientists by training.

238. The ET also finds that although several technical consultants have been engaged but they are hired on a job-by-job basis, mostly to conduct studies on economic valuation of natural resources, not to build capacity of REO and community on PES planning process.

239. The skills in stakeholder analysis, engagement, communication and management, conflict resolution, mediation and contract negotiation were considered to be weak in the REOs by the MTR, with some improvements as observed by the ET but not yet to the level that they could be confident trainer in these fields.

240. Since all of the afore-mentioned skills do not appear to have been substantially enhanced through/by the CBFCM project, it raises the question whether REOs will be able to be lead agencies for PES related efforts.

241. However, some enhanced capacity to monitor and evaluate brown issues were achieved through their engagement in project activities, for example in water, air, soil, and environmental quality monitoring and analysis.

242. The ProDoc stated that government agencies lacked capacity in monitoring of GHG emission reduction and capture through land use and land use change, and explained that the project would help to build capacities to address this gap. The ET finds that REO staff received training on biocarbon assessment in the initial year of the project. The techniques were later on trained to and applied by one pilot community (viz. Community forest committee in Ubon Ratchathani) to measure trees in their community forest. However, there was no systematic way to record amount of carbon stock created by the forest. This could be an area for improvement in the future to develop solid database which community could use as a basis to negotiate for PES arrangement.

Overall Outcome 1 Results: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

3.3.2.2 Outcome 2

243. **Expanded CBFCM coverage through pilot testing and up-scaling of best practice using PES and bio-carbon financing schemes and mechanisms**:

244. The pilot testing has resulted in some expanded CBFCM coverage in some of the pilot sites. Although the precise modality of community-based forest management in Thai context is still work in progress, the project has supported pilot communities in voluntary community-based conservation activities which resulted in expanded areas benefiting from sustainable forest and catchment practices. Construction of living weirs in Mae Sa catchment has gone beyond the original pilot communities to those in nearby disctricts through community networking process. More farmers benefit from sufficient water irrigated to their fields. In some villages, the weirs aslo serve as recreational area for the villagers. Mangrove rehabilitation and conservation in Tha Chin catchment contributed to expanded mangrove forest coverage whist regular community-based river watch scheme in Pittayalongkorn canal resulted in improved water quality in the canal and better hygiene condition for households along the canal. Construction of artificial coral reefs along Pha-Ngan coastlines helped to increase fish stock and marine resources which proves to have both economical and environmental values to the pilot site.

245. The project has made advances in terms of creating situations where stakeholders convened to discuss shared issues and measures to collectively address them. MOUs between local

community groups/networks and private sector/state enterprises/ government organizations were established to express common interest to collaborate on sustainable environmental conservation activities which will benefit all. However, the agreements were not yet based on the ecosystem services valuation.

Pilot Site 1 - Mae Sa Watershed, Northern Thailand / Chiang Mai Province.

246. It is important to note that the efforts at Mae Sa have benefited and capitalised on pre-existing CBFCM relevant practices before this project began. This CBFCM project has enhanced these capacities in several important ways.

247. Stakeholders including local communities, private sectors and local governments (TAO) have collaboratively adopted CBFCM approach. In total, sixteen living weirs were constructed within the pilot site area, much more than the planned two weirs; and more living weirs are already being planned. Expansion has gone beyond the original project boundary, i.e. to an adjacent area (to the north of the pilot site), which even belongs to a different sub-district. REO 1 has hired a consultant to study impact of the weirs on the environment as well as livelihoods of the villagers. It was reported that the quantity of water has significantly increased all year round. Around 30 households whose rice fileds are located near the weirs have benefited from sufficient water supply, and hence the increase in their income from rice. Water quality has improved to the level that the Mae Raem Office of Water Works Authorities has signed an MOU to support communities to continue their conservation activities (i.e. weirs maintenance and forest rehabilitation). Improvements in the environment are reported in terms of increase in fauna and flora species as well as fresh water algae.

248. Watershed forest was better protected from unsustainable practices of the elephant camp. The stakeholder network has developed an integrated plan for Mae Sa Watershed rehabilitation and management including projects on water (quality and quantity), biodiversity and forest, fire prevention, and waste management.

249. Through the Mae Sa Watershed Management Committee established by the project, linking to existing structure of provincial and local governments as well as private sector association, more funding will be mobilised from the provincial development budget, PAO, and tourism-related businesses in the sub-districts. The TE sees promising signs that this committee would continue to function after the project ends. At the time of the TE interview, it was reported that some of the project activities have already been absorped by different funding sources. For example, PAO through Mae Rim district development planning will partially finance the construction of more weirs to cover all sub-districts, starting fiscal year 2018. The District office also developed a proposal to request the Governor's budget to continue activities initiated by the project. To keep the momentum, private sector and communities have set up a network to develop long-term conservation plan for Mae Sa catchment including activities in water, forest, and waste management and forest fire prevention. The network's office will be located in TAO and financial plan for fund mobilisation/donation is in place.

250. It is important to note that progress has been substantial. Through networking process, the model of living weirs is also adopted by TAO in another district.

Pilot Site 2: Tha Chin Watershed, Central Thailand/ Samut Sakorn province

251. The project focused on improving water quality and restoring wetland mangrove forest areas, as well as enhancing knowledge sharing. The project has achieved some progress and positive impact.

252. Naturally, the positive impacts from restored and expanded mangrove areas will take years to take effect, as mangroves need time to properly develop the habitat and conditions required for fish to spawn and for other organisms to inhabit the areas. Indigenous knowledge has been applied to design and implement the restoration efforts. It has established sharing of benefits from rehabilitation of mangroves in private lands. Forests are of value to tourism in the region, and this has attracted some attention from private sector as investors into rehabilitation, irrespective of whether the forest areas are of direct service to the companies or are affected by the companies.
253. The ET notes that TAOs have been well engaged in the project. Thus, the practice of community-based management approaches has been well established, and it is even planned to expand this to cover all of the eight tambons in the district through the role of the Internal Security Command Office who will serve as coordinator to facilitate implementation of planned activities under the signed MOU.
254. The work to improve water quality in the canal has focused on establishing a monitoring system along the canal to monitor the changes in certain key organic and inorganic parameters. It is unclear the extent to which the system has yet been useful. Information from the monitoring is reported to TAO to set a plan for prevention and improvement. In case of highly polluted cases, the Internal Security Command Office will coordinate with relevant agencies for remedial actions.
255. In terms of the private sector, the ET finds that the private sector investments into environmental improvements may not be directly linked to the services which they either depend upon or affects.

Pilot Site 3: Lam Sebai Watershed, North-eastern Thailand, Ubon Ratchathani.

256. Lam Sebai catchment was selected as pilot site because the community forest management committee has been effective. Rules and regulations for forest conservation have been developed through consensus process with every household in the community. The regulations were strictly applied and there had not been reports on encroachment during recent years. However, households are allowed to collect non-timber forest products for livelihoods.
257. The project further enhanced existing capacity by providing training on carbon credit knowledge and the community is now reasonably well equipped to monitor carbon sequestration capacity of their forest.
258. However, the ET finds that the private sector companies which were engaged in the project, did not substantially benefit from the carbon sequestration and CBFCM services which the community provides. They are located in a different catchment and are engaged to support the community on a more or less philanthropy basis. Thus, the waste donated to the local communities to make organic fertiliser was in fact a very tiny fraction of the total waste created by the companies. The perception by the ET from interviews with the local communities was that their interest in the waste rather luke-warm, due to the difficulties of using the waste and selling of the fertiliser at a reasonable price.

Pilot Site 4: Koh Phangan – Southern Thailand – Suratthani Province.

259. Pha-Ngan watershed was selected to represent an island ecosystem which covers both watershed and coastal areas. In the beginning, REO 14 had a challenging time in engaging stakeholders, especially in upstream area as the watershed forest is under preparation stage to become a national park. This challenge has been realised and discussed since the inception phase and much adaptive management had been made to accommodate how REO could find the right hook to

engage with communities. It was agreed among PMU, REO 14, technical advisors and UNDP that REO 14 could focus on water quality, crab banks, and coral reef rehabilitation while making some links with upstream communities through organic coconut grower groups in the forest buffer zones.

260. The shift from forest to coastal conservation was made and series of campaigns on environmental issues (e.g. waste, mangrove, water quality, food security), were conducted resulting in increased awareness of the public on the issues. Crab banks and coral reef rehabilitation led to the increase in crab stock and fisherfolk's income as well as marine natural resources in coastal area.
261. A multi-sectoral stakeholder network: Friends of Pha-ngan was established to collaboratively promote 'sustainable Pha-Ngan development' concept. Through this mechanism the project has gradually engaged communities from catchment area as part of the network. But the activities are still concentrated on the coastal area. MOUs between coastal communities and private sector (hotel association and entreprise association) were signed to continue conservation activities.
262. The ET acknowledges that the focus on crab banks, etc., may in themselves prove beneficial to the local communities, but that the relevance to the current project have been rather elusive.
263. The fact that many of the important actors on Koh Phangan are not from the local areas, but rather business people from outside seeing business opportunities and bringing capital and a workforce into the island also made it difficult for the project to identify the 'right' actors during the initial implementation period.
264. Outcome 2 has three outputs:
265. **Output 2.1 Capacities of local authorities, landholders, and the private sector enhanced to ensure market-based payments and harness innovative financing for improved livelihoods**:
266. The ET finds that capacity of local authorities, landholders and the private sector has been improved but that capacity building has been ad hoc and sporadic, rather than conducted in a systematically planned manner.
267. An important achievement is that the broad range of local stakeholders (including municipalities, private sector operators, government agencies, CSOs, local communities on several levels, monks, etc.) have enhanced capacity to work together. This has also worked towards creating a common understanding about how sustainable livelihoods is linked to and dependent upon ecosystem services and health.
268. There still appears to be substantial uncertainty and/or disagreement regarding the definition of PES. However, several rather solid PES-like cases have been developed, particularly water provisioning in the Mae Sa catchment, coastal protection by mangrove forests in Tha Chin catchment. The project has made the first tentative steps in the right direction towards future PES schemes linked to CBFCM.
269. **Output 2.2 Catchment level ecosystem services valuation (including bio-carbon) and assessment of benefits, trade-offs and opportunity costs of land-use options**
270. Valuations have been conducted in all sites, and mostly by consultants with some participation from local communities, municipalities, etc. However, the ET finds that the resulting reports were not integrated and communities have not been able to use/apply the reports for negotiations, both because the reports have not been sufficiently communicated (i.e., explained; as opposed to merely distributed) to the communities, and because communities have not sufficiently been equipped with the negotiating skills to make use of these valuations. However, the valuation process itself has a positive effect on local communities and those who participated as it clarified the links between ecosystems (i.e. ecosystem services) and livelihoods and economic value.

271. The TE agrees with the MTR that the project was not able to demonstrate bio-carbon - for reasons beyond the control of the project. Carbon assessments have been made and thereby established both a capacity to do so and an understanding of why and how this can be used in the future. However, considering the current pricing (and structures), it is uneconomical to establish such a scheme.
272. Baseline data on key indicator species in 4 pilot sites have been collected. At the time of TE, no updated data were made available. However, it was reported during the interviews with local communities that conservation activities conducted in pilot sites have, to a certain extent, reduced threats on the environment and enhanced bio-diversity values in respective areas. For example, more fish and marine species in coastal areas in Pha-Ngan from coral reef rehabilitation and more crabs from crab bank activity; increased water flow in Mae Sa catchment areas as a result of living weir construction, and better water quality in the Pittayalongkorn canal inTa Chin catchment as a result of the 'river watch' activity.
273. Livlihood quality of household in pilot sites were identified by income level and a few other sustainable livelihood Index. At the time of the TE, baseline data was available. The project was in the process of hiring a consultant to collect the data on updated situation. Since there have not yet been any PES schemes up and running, any increase in household income, if any, will be less likely associated with PES activities.
274. **Output 2.3 Land-use based and biodiversity friendly PES and bio-carbon financing strategies for CBFCM with result-based, equitable, transparent and unified payment distribution structure in place in 4 REO regions.**
275. The ET finds that the project did not sufficiently pursue strategic and systematic approaches to develop PES strategies for CBFCM. Rather, the ET finds that it is still in its infancy – the experience achieved thus far has been based on a trial and error approach, in part due to the lack of clear working definitions of PES and CBFCM.
276. The experience gained by the REOs so far is building a sound basis for developing PES schemes in the future but completed working examples in the lifetime of this project, considering the baseline at the start, are too ambitious.
277. The process taking place at the REO level has countered many of the obstacles which invariably stand in the way of effective community-based natural resource management. For instance, one of the "communities in the Mae Sa catchment consists of a "community forest" which is actually inside the territory of a national park. While there is a community Committee established, there is also a second and ethnically different community which uses the forest as well as a private enterprise with roots in the community but nonetheless a private property which uses the forest for tourism activities.
278. The capacities of the communities are still deemed insufficient for them to manage natural resources sufficiently effective according to any robust PES schemes. Additional confounding factor is the extent to which they will be able to negotiate fair deals with the private sector.
279. As mentioned above, there has been some expansion in areas managed according to CBFCM approaches. However, this expansion has not involved or applied PES because the link to real(istic) buyers was not established during the lifetime of the project. The MOUs then serve as mutual agreements indicating some contributions from private sector/local governments to support community's conservation schemes/activities which may or may not have direct benefit on private sector's business.

Pilot Site 1: Mae Sa:

280. The living weirs contribute to improved water quality and quantity and both private sector and communities benefit from this. The current MOU between community and the Water Works Authority is not based on buying/selling ES, but rather is mainly a mechanism for collaborative management. These agreements are helpful to the Waterworks Authority by ensuring good water quality – thus, actually the Waterworks Authority is a potential buyer of ES. In order for this MoU between the communities and Water Works Authority to pave way for future PES agreement, there are more work require from both sides. The communities must be able to supply the water at the quantity and quality that meet the standards. Economic value of the water must be assessed and used as a basis for fair PES negotiations. The Water Works Authority will need to look into bottle necks in its rules and regulation to enter into PES agreement with the communities and make any necessary adjustments.
281. Private sector is also a potential buyer of the CBFCM services. A number of tourism-related businesses are located in the pilot areas and could well benefit from the better managed natural resources which are important for their businesses. As part of the project exit strategy, a committee is established at watershed level (i.e. Mae Sa and Mae Raem Watershed Management Committee) to continue project initiatives. This committee is officially appointed and comprising representatives of key actors from government and private sectors as well as communities as already explained. Concrete actions have been taken by the committee to ensure continuity of project activities after the project ends, including securing budget from the Governor, PAO, and private sector to support conservation plans jointly developed.
282. The committee will propose that every business located within the boundaries of these two watersheds will contribute at least 1,000 Baht into the conservation fund to expand environmental conservation activities (e.g. living weirs, forest and biodiversity conservation, forest fire prevention, waste management). These private businesses are, in a way, collective buyers of the services by communities.

Pilot Site 2: Tha Chin

283. Four MOUs have been signed between corporates/potential supporters and community networks to support CBFCM. The first MOU is between community-based mangrove protection network and the Office of Internal Security Command to increase mangrove areas and prevent erosion. The second MOU is between Thai Tap Water (TTW) company and Water Watch Network where TTW would provide funding to support community's ongoing activities for the initial period of 1 year. The third MoU focuses on awareness raising of the public, communities, school children on ecosystem conservation. TTW and Provincial Administration Organization will support community-based KM network to develop curriculum and conduct trainings in relevant areas. The last MoU was signed between the local government (TAO) and Phun Tai Norasing Foundation to increase mangrove coverage around the area where the foundation is located.
284. Although all of these MOUs at this stage are not purchase agreements of PES but rather philanthropy/CSR by private sector, they have put in place collaboration between community and private sector. More work will need to be done to really develop the real PES agreements for the community's services based on the 'willingness to pay' of the businesses who benefit from these services.

Pilot Site 3 – Lam Sabai

285. Companies provide relatively little waste to communities to compose fertilizer. It is expected that biofertilizer would be distributed to households who participate in forest conservation to reduce their costs on chemical fertiliser and the excess supply could be sold to get extra money for their

conservation fund. However, the amount of waste was too little to be considered as 'fair contribution'. The two companies are not directly benefiting from the conservation of Lam Sebai watershed forest as they are located in another catchment. The indirect benefit, however, could be carbon offset from the forest as way to compensate carbon emissions from their production process. Further work will need to be done to systematically monitor the amount of carbon credits/carbon sequestration generated from Lam Sebai forest and to negotiation with the companies to use these carbon credits to offset their emissions.

286. Carbon credits can currently be purchased at low costs, so the extent to whether the local communities are currently getting a fair deal is perhaps questionable.

Pilot Site 4: Kho Pha-Ngan

287. Three MOUs were signed between community groups and local businesses but more on philantrophy basis to support community-based conservation activities such as water quality testing, mangrove rehabilitation, crab banks and food security, artificial reefs, campaigns to stop usingin foam containers and plastic bags, etc.

Overall Outcome 2 Results: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

3.3.3 Relevance:

288. As elaborated on in the ProDoc, there was - and still is – a clear and well-defined rationale, need and scope for the objectives, outcomes and outputs of the present project, though the inception phase could have been improved. This is certainly the case at the national level.

289. At the provincial level, there is a big demand for more environmentally friendly approaches, as evidenced by Provincial Development Strategic Plans of the 4 pilot sites:

Chiang Mai: Promote sustainable NRM by using technologies and innovations

Samut Sakorn: Accelerate balance in ecosystem to increase natural resources

Ubon Rachatani: Sustainable management of natural resources and environment

Surat Thani: Develop sustainable natural resource base and environment

290. The selection of partners and stakeholders was certainly appropriate, though perhaps the match between the private sector and communities could have been better, illustrated as follows.

Pilot Site 1 – Mae Sa

291. The project was definitely relevant to the local context, as the area experienced frequent water quality problems and occasional droughts/shortage of water. There have been community-based conservation efforts going on before the project started. The project has built upon this existing social capital.

Pilot Site 2 – Tha Chin

292. Local communities had been facing substantial negative consequences resulting from the degrading mangrove forest areas and from the adverse impacts of pollution on the water quality and quantity of the canal. The project area covers 3 sub-districts where conservation activities have been initiated by local community volunteer groups in each sub-district. The project helped to leverage the level of community's engagement in CBFCM by establishing networks among these three sub-districts.

Pilot Site 3: Lam Sabai

293. There appears to have rather strong interest in the project, among both local communities and the private sector. The community has been engaged in sustainable management of their community forest for more than 20 years. Hence, a strong case of existing CBFCM practices even without the project. The project, however, helped to build capacity of the community in systematic valuation of their forests and raise the awareness on their values.
294. As for the other pilot sites, this has perhaps not been matched by the capacity of local government, including understanding PES concepts and implementation modalities. The private sector's interest in the project may not be matched by their commitment in terms of the relative investments into the project. Some companies may have been involved due to the CSR value (possibly for its communication and marketing value).

Pilot Site 4 – Koh Pha Ngan

295. The scope of the original ProDoc was relevant to Koh Pha Ngan, but the project seems to have been unevenly implemented with limited efforts on actual community based forest and watershed management issues due to legal contraints prohibiting community activities in the future national park. However, it would have been very useful/appropriate, if the very limited work on organic farming by midstream communities during the initial months of the project had received much higher focus and priority by the project. Having said so, the project is successful in mobilising multi-stakeholder collaboration in addressing issues unique to local environmental and natural resource management.
296. The established crab banks, etc., will very likely deliver substantial benefits to the local communities. With reference to the ProDoc and the defined outcomes/outputs, however, the relevance to the CBFCM approach is at best indirect: in terms of ensuring sustained income from fisheries and thus potentially reducing the communities' pressure on forest areas – with some positive impact on the seawater quality if the rivers/streams arising from the forest covered mountains would flow into areas in the sea near the established crab banks, etc.
297. Had the emphasis been on the organic farming, the justification would be more direct in terms of developing alternative and environmentally friendly practices to reduce impacts on the upland forest resources.

Overall Relvance: Relevant (R)

3.3.4 Effectiveness :

298. **Achieving the Project Objective**
299. Overall, the project objective is advanced but not fully achieved. To have better achievement, more cohesive and strategic management is required, and an engagement of a Chief Techncial Advisor is necessary.
300. Under outcome 1 refering to strengthened policy environment and systematic capacities to promote sustainable CBFCM through PES, National Environment Quality Plan (2017-2022) and Regional Natural Resource Management Plans have incorporated PES as promsing economic instrument to engage community and private sector in CBFCM and sustainable natural resource management. Capacities at REOs have been enhanced through technical training, on the job coaching and direct engagement in project implementation but not enough attention is given to systematic drawing of grounded knowledge generated from hands-on experience. Database on PES was established to provide information on existing and emerging CBFCM schemes which could potentially be supported by private sector under PES arrangement. No functional/formal

mechanism was established for policy feedback at national level. However, it is recommended that a new unit to continue PES policy dialougues and support to implementation on the ground is established under MONRE.

301. Outcome 2 focuses on expanded CBFCM coverage through pilot testing and upscaling of best practice using PES and biocarbob schemes/mechanisms. A number of MOUs between local communities and private sector, government enterprises and government agencies were developed/signed to continue collaboration on community's ongoing efforts in sustainable natural resource management. Basic information on ecosystem service valuation is available. In some pilot sites, there is potential to turn some of the signed MOUs into PES agreement based on these economic values.

302. Effectiveness of project implementation was affected by a number of external and internal factors. There was a big gap after the first PM resigned before the replacement was recruited. Frequent institutional changes within MONRE which affected project line of execution has affected not only the operational and management side of the project, but its substantive progress towards outcomes due to the lack of understanding and ownership of the project. The lack of systematic technical guidance from the project management unit also impacted on effectiveness. In the absence of Chief Technical Advisor, the project has engaged several technical consultants but most of them were on a job-by-job contract. There was limited effort from the PMU to ensure that their services were coherent, leading the project towards the same direction.

Effectiveness: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

3.3.5 Efficiency

303. The project experienced several long delays. The reasons include:

- Insufficient and weak recordings of financial transactions and accounting in general. This resulted in the problems and the long delay due to the audit discovery of irregularities.
- Insufficient and often delayed/not timely technical support to the REOs. The technical support lacked overall integration and strategic approach.
- Timely delivery has also been affected by the requirement to expend 80% on a quarterly basis before release of next quarter's instalment.
- The Project Management office was hosted by different agencies during the project life, including the latest shift from Pollution Control Department (PCD) to MONRE Permanent Secretary Office since the MTR. Although the argument for changing the host institution may have been valid, it has invariably caused substantial transaction costs in terms of implementation delays and management issues.
- The project would have benefited from a clearer and better functioning management structure, coordination and communication among management members.
- Insufficient oversight of the project. Tighter and more frequent oversight of the project would have enabled/enhanced the likelihood that the project could remain on track.
- Careful consideration of communication should have received stronger emphasis in the project design and implementation. It should have been anticipated that effective and accurate communication would become crucial because of the complex design, many vertical layers of government authorities, the pilot sites being widely dispersed, and of course with a new complex and difficult subject matter.

304. Overall the substantial delays caused many activities to be implemented and resulting outputs to be delivered during the final few months, irrespective of whether the timing was strategically appropriate or the time allocated for the assignments (of consultants) and the activities were sufficient to really achieve the intended strategic outcomes.

Efficiency: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

3.3.6 Country Ownership

305. UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are implemented with the explicit agreement and involvement of the appropriate ministries and departments, both during the project design phase and during implementation. Indeed, such projects are implicitly intended to serve and complement the national agenda. For these reasons, the Project Management Unit was hosted by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment. The PPG took over a year and with engagement from the level of the Deputy Permanent Secretary and the REO Chiefs (1,5,12,14) from the very start. Extensive community consultations also took place to identify the piot sites. The same goes to the inception, due emphasis was given but the several shifts and changes of focal units within MONRE made it very difficult for the project to have a meaningful inception phase to provide the basis for a better project implementation.
306. The ET feels that the frequent shifts of the project from PS office to PCD and back to PS office do reflect varying levels of country ownership over the project. Although the project is regarded as beneficiary by MONRE, the different management styles by different hosts do have impact on the implementation strategies and efficiency
307. At the Pilot Site level, the ET finds that the rationale for selection of the combination of sites was sound. However, the project did perhaps not achieve full buy-in and commitment from some of the REOs for the specific scope, objectives, outcomes and outputs which the project was designed to achieve. This - combined with insufficient direction, guidance and technical support – was particularly pronounced at Koh Pha Ngan, where project implementation has been more complicated due to realities and complexity of environmental issues in the selected site.

3.3.7 Mainstreaming

308. The ET acknowledges the positive signs that PES and bio-carbon concepts are gradually finding its way into CBFCM management approaches. This is best illustrated by the various MOUs developed and committees established at the REO and TAO levels. However, in terms of real impact on the ground and whether the enhanced PES and bio-carbon understanding can be sustained past the project closure remains to be seen.
309. In several pilot sites, the private sector has shown its active commitment towards PES, especially clear where the positive returns and benefits to the company are most pronounced. For example, at Mae Sa, where the construction of living weirs has delivered benefits not only the local communities but also to the companies which co- invested in their construction.
310. Mainstreaming at national policy level is still far from having been achieved. Unless the PES management Unit, or some similar approach under the Forest Resource and Land Unit is established to drive necessary amendments in the Environmental Quality Act, there will be no clear other mechanism to materialise this.
311. It should be noted though that nearly all departments within MONRE have been familiarized with the PES concept, but have however not yet been equipped with practical implementation skills and knowledge.

312. Poverty alleviation was expected to be achieved through implementation of PES schemes which would eventually increase income of participating community in pilot sites. Livelihoods improvement is one of the indicators to be achieved under Outcome 2. Although there was no official report on the rise of community's income from project activities at the time of the TE, information from field visits and stakeholder interviews indicated signs towards positive direction. Increased fish and crab stock in coastal areas of Koh Pha Ngan and improved water supply to rice fields in Mae Sa catchment resulted in increased income of fisherfolks and rice farmers.
313. In pilot sites, women participation in project activities was evident at both decision making and operational levels. In Tha Chin catchement, for example, women took a lead in regular checking of water quality in the canal whereas men focused on mangrove rehabilitation. In Mae Sa catchment, women participated in weir construction and forest rehabilitation. However, it was not clear if this was the result of the planned gender mainstreaming process or it just happened naturally.
314. Through their participation in project activities, communities in pilot sites have gained knowledge to better cope with natural disasters. For instance, they learned that mangrove rehabilitation helped to prevent erosion of coastal areas and damages caused by storms or tsunami; construction of living weirs helped to improve problems associated with drought in dry season and overflow of water in rainy season; and better management of community forest helped to reduce GHG emission.
315. The project does not appear to have direct linkage with other UNDP programmes but it shared some common development issues with some other projects. For example, the project "Leadership Academy for Muslim Women in Southern Provinces of Thailand" aimed to build leadership capacities for the women in addressing poverty and environmental problems in their respective communities.

3.3.8 Sustainability

316. Table 1 below provides the TEs assessment of the risk analysis provided by the Project Document and subsequently assessed by MTR. Risk assessments were too optimistic particularly as related to CBFCM. It was assumed that CBFCM itself had minimal problems. However, the CBFCM system faces substantial inefficiencies, which will mitigate against the successful management of common pool ecosystem resources (e.g. internal divisions within communities, included private lands, open access systems, a lack of function efficiency in the unit of community management, etc.). The project lacked specialist with technical skills and experience to address community-based natural resource management though these skills are gradually being developed at the REO level.
317. The ET finds that there were sufficient intellectual and human resources to address these issues, but that the time horizon to achieve this was not realistic.
318. The achievements, and possibly even the outcomes of the project (cf. SRF), will likely be maintained after project closure under the conditions that (i) PES unit or the like is established under MONRE to support/facilitate the implementation of the signed MoUs, and (ii) mechanisms established in pilot sites to implement the MoUs are functioning. This will be an important beginning towards future functional CBFCM and PES financing systems.

Table 1 Project Document Risk Ratings: **ET's assessment of whether perceived risks (from ProDoc and the MTR) materialised, and updated status of risks**

Risk	Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy	MTR Assessment	Terminal Evaluation
Institutional Support	L-M-H			
Weak coordination within and between local and national government institutions responsible for forest and land management; limited capacity (especially at lower levels) to interact with land users on forest management	L-M	The project will support and facilitate activities to ensure improved institutional coordination, capacity building and awareness-raising at the national, provincial and district levels. The project's "Output 1.2 Functional multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM in place with participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, REOs, ONEP and Royal Forest Department that facilitates effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing, and self-capacity development.	Given the Project Document's assessment of the enabling environment for CBFCM and the identified barriers in particular that the enabling environment is weak, and that the Senate rejected key provisions to the 2000 Community Forest Management Bill and proposed amendments that would prevent local people in having a greater role in Thailand's forests and also that the experience of CBFCM was essentially limited to a number of sites and projects this rating is too low. The MTR would put this as a *high* risk.	The Government of Thailand has launched a nationwide effort to reclaim illegally cleared forest lands ("Tuang Khuen Phuen Pa" policy). This was conducted through consultative/ participatory approach, which may have reduced conflicts and enhanced success. Therefore, the ET finds that this risk to be L-M.
Policy				
Inconsistent national planning, budgeting, and policies concerning forestry, environmental protection and rural development, combined with additional inconsistency in provincial and district regulations and enforcement practices	L	The project's "Output 1.1 Harmonized policies, plans and legal instruments to support CBFCM and PES and bio-carbon schemes" will assist the government in harmonizing some key policies	As above, if *legal instruments* were to be used then there was a factor largely outside the control of the project unless these were Ministerial regulations. Otherwise it is the role of Parliament to produce Law and this, given the timescale of the project carries higher risks. Furthermore, as	This is still relevant and valid, since there has been limited project progress under Output 1.1 since the MTR.

			noted by the UNDP CO; *the capacity of the "change agent" to champion new ideas and concepts was not thought through with an integrated approach to build the necessary capacities and incentives*". Therefore, this risk rating should have been at least *moderate* if not *high*.	
Local Support				
Sustainable forest management does not lead to sufficient economic gains for households at the project sites	L-M	Only practices identified by local communities themselves as socio-economically sustainable will be disseminated for adoption on a broader scale. The project will further reduce this risk by encouraging sustainable harvesting of NTFPs and by rapidly building the capacity of communities to engage in PES and carbon financing. The project design phase has already identified a number of options for increased income for communities through PES, as outlined under Component 2 of the project.	The rating is probably reasonable, with the caveat that many of the forests appear to have multiple levels of tenure and even contested tenure (e.g. in Mae Sa catchment) and there appears to be resistance to devolution of authority tenure to communities (e.g. the 2000 Community Forest Management Bill amendments by the Senate) and that four years is a very short space of time to achieve this. Therefore, the risk ratings are too low and should have been at least *moderate*.	Same.
Land ownership and land access rights are not sufficiently clear with regard to community forests. Hence, the project strategy and incentives developed	L-M	The project will address this risk by strengthening the policy framework on communities' right to access forest resources. In fact, this is a key result of	As above, this was expecting too much in four years and the risk rating should have been *high*.	More harmonized agreements, based on the extent to which local communities are permitted to undertake conservation efforts – and possibly

by the project will not be effective.		the project – the creation of vertical linkages to allow practices on the grounds to effect changes in national policy. In absence of complete rights over communal forests, the payments they receive may be considered as an added incentive for forest management.		reinforced by the recent forest reclamation law. The TE maintains the rating at L-M.
Environmental				
Effects of climate change, including temperature and sea level rises, ENSOs and natural disasters (forest fire, drought, flood, etc.) might increase the natural loss of carbon stocks and biodiversity at the landscape level.	L	Given that climate change is likely to affect forest ecosystems, catchment functions and biodiversity over time, the project will assess and consider risks regarding climate change during assessment and capacity building activities ("climate proofing"). The project will also coordinate with relevant authorities to support disaster risk management to minimize natural disaster risks affecting forests and catchments.	The MTR agrees with this rating.	Same.

3.3.7.1 Financial risks to sustainability

319. *Project Document*: The first component of the project, which focuses on national enabling environment, a key thrust of the project is to pilot the use of PES and bio-carbon financing mechanism for effective forest catchment management at local level. The project will ensure that such mechanisms at the local level are sustainable.
320. *TE*: Speaking of financial sustainability of developed PES schemes at this late/final stage of the project is perhaps not appropriate, because no full PES schemes were developed by the project. However, initial steps have been taken and progress of some of the site-specific cases are promising.
321. At the time of the TE, there does not appear to be much hope and scope for additional funds from either REO or central MONRE towards PES work. Meanwhile, the ET recognizes that there may be some opportunities to generate and access funds at the local level, including the

following: Governor's budget; PAOs; TAOs, and possibly continual support from private sectors from the MOUs.

322. In addition, the gradual - albeit rather slow – enhanced awareness of PES and bio-carbon schemes (for effective forest catchment management) at local levels (including among relevant local government authorities, local communities and the private sector) provides some hope that over time, financially sustainable schemes will be reached. The ET feels – though – that sustained support from the REOs will be required, so it is important to also ensure the continued support and commitment from the national and provincial levels, including appropriate funding allocation within the national and provincial budget planning. The ET notes that there are positive signs that this may indeed happen over time, considering the specific inclusion of PES within several of the planning and policy documents at national, regional, and provincial levels. This may, over time, secure specific budget allocations.

3.3.7.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability

323. *Project Document*: The capacity building activities, networking and continuous field-level presence by the management agencies (state, private and civil society) will help achieve social sustainability of the project. The build-up of trust through dialogues and stakeholder consultations, and stakeholder mobilization through capacity building by the project will assist in achieving this long-term objective. The strong focus on building on local knowledge, capacities, and incentives and ensuring gender equity are expected to lead to social sustainability.

324. *TE*: The ET finds that many local communities are committed and reasonably equipped to continue and maintain the drive for conservation efforts. For most communities in pilot sites, the volunteer spirits remained high. Upstream communities protect their forests and natural resources primarily not to 'sell' the service but for their own good as their lives depend on these resources. In some area (e.g. Mae Sa), private sector demonstrated high sense of commitment to give back to the society and nature. Community organizations and their networks as well as specific multi-sectoral committees were set up and appeared to be capable to continue their CBFCM plans. But long-term sustainability in terms of PES arrangement/management may depend on communities' ability to negotiate fair deals with the private sector. In this context, the ET observes that some communities appear content with their current socio-economic status/situation, but whether this will remain valid for the next generation, remains unknown. From a negotiating standpoint, it could perhaps be argued that the apparent satisfaction with their current economic situation puts them in a strategically less favourable position during negotiations with private sector companies. Enhancing their negotiating skills should be considered important.

3.3.7.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

325. *Project Document*: The project builds upon existing institutional government structures. The only new institutional mechanism proposed (a working group under Output 1.2) will be linked to national process and is expected to be sustainable as long as participants find it useful. This is a relatively low cost and will not be expensive to maintain by the government post project completion.

326. *ET*: The ET finds the statement to be reasonable. While the TE recognizes that the Government of Thailand shows interest in pursuing PES at many levels of the policy and planning levels, the structure and nature of this is much less clear. The continued lack of a common understanding of PES is disconcerting. The project had strongly recommended a specific PES Unit established to (i)

develop PES mechanism and its inclusion on departmental plan and (ii) promote public awareness and participation in PES process.

327. The ET concludes that it will be challenging for the PES efforts to be sustained by piloting REOs mainly because PES is not part of the REOs' current scope and mandate, and because the strongly recommended PES unit (in the ProDoc and reiterated in the MTR) has not yet been established to support continuation of PES-related activities /MOUs in pilot sites. For non-pilot REOs, although PES is included in their natural resource management strategies, they need to have technical advice and proven models to adopt. This will not be possible without the strongly recommended PES unit.

328. However, this may change if the PES unit is indeed established as recommended as it is a critical step to ensure that PES becomes an integral part of REOs.

329. At the time of TE finding briefing, it seemed that the idea was picked up and it is likely that the Forest Resource and Land Unit under the newlyestablished National Reconciling Office in MONRE will include PES-related mandate.

330. At the community level, committees and working groups have been established in some regions, and these will probably prove important towards ensuring longer-term sustainability

3.3.7.4 Environmental risks to sustainability

331. *Project Document*: The primary purpose of this project is to achieve environmental sustainability in Thailand. The first component of the project builds national to local capacities of government agencies whose mandate is to protect Thailand's environment. The second component's focus on improving better forestry and catchment management through sustained financial incentive is expected to lead to better environmental sustainability.

332. *TE*: The ET agrees with this statement. In addition, irrespective of the present project, there is a general societal trend towards enhanced environmental sustainability to address deteriorating ecosystem services (such as coastal erosion, flood mitigation, and water flow quantity and quality), including through environmentally friendly practices, climate change risk preparedness and mitigation. Within the CBFCM project, this is also valid for the involved regions and tambons, where environmental sustainability is increasingly on the agenda.

333. Therefore, the ET finds that the project initiatives may have laid the foundation for continual conservation activities by the project stakeholders in local areas (even without the project existence) as they are increasingly faced with environmental crisis (e.g., drought, flood, heat, etc.).

Overall Sustainability: Moderately Likely (ML)

3.8 Impact

334. Long-term impact of the project is demonstrated through (i) verifiable improvements in ecological status, and (ii) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems. In the absence of data on updated status of key species as identified in the SRF, changes/improvements in ecological status and reductions in stress on ecological systems cannot yet be systematically verified. However, at the time of TE it was evident that some pilot sites have already seen positive improvements in the environment as a result of their conservation efforts. For example, in Mae Sa (increased water flow and improved water quality); Tha Chin (expanded rehabilitated mangrove area and better water quality in public canal, and Pha-Ngan (increased fish and marine stock in coastal area as reported by REOs and community groups in pilot sites and witnessed by the ET during field visits.

335. With demonstrated commitment of stakeholders in the four pilot sites to continue their CBFCM and conservation activities under the MOUs as well as those indicated in community action plans and TAO development plans, it is very likely that in the long-run the project will have evident impact on the ecological systems/status in the areas it has operated. The degree of impact, however, will also be associated with the scale and quality of activities to be implemented.

4 Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

336. The CBFCM project has delivered a substantial set of achievements in spite of the multitudes of problems that the project has faced during its lifetime. Some of those problems have been self-inflicted from the design-phase (especially lack of working definitions; poor tactical cohesion between the two outcomes; PMU design and structure; inconsistencies and lack of clarity in the logframe, indicators and targets; and site selection) as well as the lack of ownership in project implementation, resulting in lack of adaptive management. There were also other challenges which were-in fairness- beyond the control of the project, particularly recurrent institutional changes within MONRE and the political instability.

337. At all levels (national, provincial, regional, tambon), the CBFCM project has contributed to lay the foundation for fundamental changes to natural resource management and valuation in the Kingdom of Thailand. Certainly, capacity building by the project has lacked a systematic and strategic approach, and the confusion caused by a lack of a clear and shared working definition of PES has been pervasive throughout the project.

338. At the local levels, the CBFCM project has helped re-shape the way in which local authorities interact and work with both local communities and companies. Local communities are not yet well equipped to be strong negotiators, but the project has contributed to enhance their empowerment to benefit from the natural resources and the ecosystem services which the management of their lands can provide to others. The communities, in a way, also benefit from the better managed ecosystems.

339. The inclusion of bio-carbon as a focus of the project was valid considering the continuing global/public interest in this. However, bio-carbon is - strictly speaking – simply one of many types of ecosystem service. The declining price of bio-carbon was certainly beyond the control of the project, but it essentially rendered the bio-carbon component of the project to be ignored.

340. The enabling environment for PES in community managed forests and catchment management has improved during the lifetime of the project, but the extent to which this can be solely and directly attributed to the project is less clear.

341. When examining the ProDoc here near project closure, several aspects still remains incomplete. Key elements which could have contributed to the achievement of the project objective were not inplace, including (i) establishment and institutionalisation of functional Multi-Sectoral working group under the National Environment Board to facilitate continuation of policy feedback and dialogues on CBFCM and PES, and (ii) effective PES schemes in pilot sites which are ready for scaling up.

342. Moreover, due to the several substantial delays in project execution, the conducted activities have often been performed in an untimely manner and without proper planning. This has made many efforts less strategic. For example, ahead of imminent project closure, several activities have been conducted – while very valuable in their own right – but with the high risk that the results will not be useful in the absence of a clear exit strategy. It will be important to ensure that

the results are well documented and communicated to relevant stakeholders and processes, to reduce the risk that they are left hanging.

335. Through the work at the pilot sites/catchments located at different parts, from upstream mountain areas (Mae Sa) to downstream lowland (Tha Chin), the project has revealed that there is a general potential for PES. At the closure of the project, there is no real operational/ functional PES schemes in place but some significant ground work has been done and there are some important case studies which have shown good potential.

336. The future policy and legal development of PES will depend on a strategic understanding of the full set of dimensions for well-functioning PES schemes. For this, the experiences from the pilot site efforts by the CBFCM project has contributed important lessons learnt.

4.2 Recommendations

Before the project closure:

337. The project has delivered a substantial set of achievements which could be further strengthened to fully achieve the project's intended objective in the long run. In the absence of the project's exit strategy, it is recommended that a concluding workshop is conducted before the project's official closure date, not only to share key achievements and lessons learnt but also to discuss how the project results/initiatives could be sustained/further developed at ministerial, regional and community levels. The workshop should include key stakeholders from every level and result in a consensus on the sustainability plan beyond the project phase. Recommendations from the TE may be used as a starting point for further review /discussion by the participants and to reach at conclusions how they could be practically adjusted to suit the realities on the ground as well as at the policy level. It should result on a roadmap for further steps.

After the project closure

Outcome 1:

338. A PES management unit or similar mechanism should be established within MONRE in order to:
    - promote/support PES and application of economic instruments in natural resource management by REOs and Provincial Environmental Offices
    - host and promote active use of updated data base on PES
    - monitor and document grounded process/lessons from the original 4 pilot sites to be used as references for policy recommendations and replication
    - based on grounded knowledge/lessons learnt, provide recommendations to develop enabling policy, strategies and mechanism to support PES

Outcome 2:

339. PES Management Unit should continue to support the 4 pilot REOs and respective communities to implement their signed MOUs (e.g. providing technical advice through consultants, ensuring sufficient budget to support REOs, etc.)

340. Participatory Action Research should be conducted at each site by a team of key stakeholders (e.g. REO, key agencies, private sector, communities) who are implementers of the MOU and PES-related activities to develop the 'know-how' on PES implementation in real context.

Site-specific recommendations

Mae Sa Catchment

341. At the community level, Mae Sa and Mae Raem Watershed Working Group will be key mechanism driving conservation activities identified in the MOU as well as community action plan which has been absorbed into TAO's development plan. Meanwhile, the Mae Sa Watershed Management Committee (chaired by Mae Rim Chief District Officer with line agencies and REO as members) should play a supporting role, e.g. providing technical advice, additional budget, and further promoting PES agreements between community groups and other potential buyers of the services where opportunities arise.
342. Participatory Action Research (PAR) should be conducted on the implementation process of different PES arrangements (current and emerging). Through the action and reflection cycle of PAR, communities together with private sector and government agencies will gradually generate knowledge and better understanding how the PES mechanism could be implemented in the real context for win-win-win (environment-community-private sector) benefits.
343. Community conservation networks to continue their activities, including monitoring improvements in natural resources in their areas, using economic valuation instruments (to be trained by NIDA). The findings could be used as basis for fair negotiations with potential buyers of PES or for resource mobilization from funding sources
344. Village # 9 in Mae Raem sub-district, Mae Rim district which has been actively implemented various conservation activities (e.g. living weirs, sustainable forest management, fire protection, etc.), should be supported to serve as a learning site on CBFCM and be equipped with IEC materials for visitors.
345. REO1 is replicating PES in a few other provinces. The process should be closely supervised/guided and monitored by REO 1 and NIDA, with systematic documentation of best practices and lessons learnt. Information on grounded implementation should be fed to the PES Management Unit on regular basis to influence necessary policy support.

Tha Chin

346. After the project closure, Office of Internal Security Operation Command (ISOC) will coordinate implementation of activities under all MOUs which have been signed under the project. PES management Unit (in collaboration with NIDA) should provide training on the practical concept and methodologies of PES to a focal point from the ISOC, leaders of the four networks responsible for implementing the four different MOUs as well as their partners from private sector. The training should include discussion how each MOU could potentially be developed in the future into PES agreements, if the conditions permit.
347. REO should support community networks to establish a result-based monitoring mechanism and systematic documentation of best practices and lessons learnt from their implementation. The lessons learnt should then be fed back to PES Management Unit.

Lam Sebai

348. The Governor of Ubol Ratchathani has appointed two committees to carry on the project initiated activities after the project ends. The Advisory Committee is chaired by Chief District Office with representatives of concerned agencies and REO 12 as members. The Implementing Committee is chaired by Mayor of Hua Don TAO; membership comprises of representatives from communities and private sector. REO 12 as secretary of both committees should ensure that the two

committees will continue to be active in supporting and driving activities under the current MOUs between Lam Sebai conservation group and private sector

349. To move from MOU to PES agreement, further work is needed. For example, to monitor and prove that the conservation of Dong Yao forest has contributed to certain amount of carbon credits. SS Alcohol company could pay for significant amount of this to off-set GHG emission from their production process and include it is their DJSI report.

Koh Pha-Ngan

350. The signed MOU should be implemented and potential to further develop them to PES agreement should be explored.
351. The 'Friends of Pha-Ngan Network' should be sustained as key driver to implement ideas jointly developed under the Sustainable Pha Ngan Plan.
352. Future linkage to mid-stream and upstream communities on sustainable environmental practices (e.g. through organic farmer groups) should be explored and stengtened through implementation of Sustainable Pha Ngan Plan with possible expanded activities to cover upland buffer zone forest areas. To the least, an action plan to solidify and continue the modest organic farming efforts should be developed.
353. Any further expansion to cover community based forest and catchment activities (from upland-the forest-covered mountains to lowlands), should be based with careful analysis/identification of drivers and possible PES/biocarbon issues.

Recommendations for future UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

354. For a project to test new and complex concepts, a CTA should be engaged throughout the project life to ensure that the underpinned concept/approach is consistently well understood and implemented.
355. More attention should be given to the inception process/phase of the project to ensure thorough understanding by key stakeholders of the project objectives, strategies, and important technical concepts as well as to secure their genuine commitment.
356. NIM proves to be a good management modality for long-term sustainability of project initiatives. However, country ownership must be firmly committed and the project should not be seen as an additional responsibility by implementing partners. It should be counted as part of their KPI, in order to get priority.
357. In addition to providing co-finance, the Implementing Partner should set up internal support system to ensure continuity of the project despite the change of administration, the willingness to address financial and operational complication and the ownership and the commitment to see the project through to the end in partnership with the IA. An example of concrete solution is to set up a special unit for project implementation. The role of the unit is to ensure efficient and effective management of the project and sustainability of its results. This unit should be operated through special arrangement to streamline bureaucratic procedures based on the approval of the top management of the IP and should be sufficiently staffed. In general, the project activities are in line with the mandates of the IP. Hence, it should become an integral part of the organization's operation and performance systems. This may require necessary revision of current KPIs to reflect extra work staff put into the project.
358. Prior to project start up, a guideline on financial and administrative procedures which harmonize UNDP and RTG rules should be developed to support smooth and timely project implementation (streamlined, practical and transparent). Training on UNDP financial/audit requirements which is

ususally provided to PM and project administration staff (both project-employed and government) during the inception phase should be refreshed on a regular basis or when need emerges.

359. UNDP should set up a small 'rescue' team to ensure that issues concerning project management are dealt with in a timely manner.

360. UNDP should provide a more rigourous training and coaching process on work planning and budget planning process to ensure that the IP understand and has the capacities to develop a result-based work plan and budget plan that could meet the financial requirement of spending up to 80% of the advanced budget before the new request can be made. This is a part of capacity building process for the government counterparts to get to know result-based management and to apply it to their day to day works.

5 Annexes

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of 'Integrated community-based forest and catchment management through an ecosystem service approach (PIMS #4033)'.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Integrated community-based forest and catchment management through an ecosystem service approach			
GEF Project ID:			*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	(UNDP PIMS#4033) 00078499 (UNDP Atlas ID)	GEF financing:	1,758,182.00	
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:	12,210,000-	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:		
Focal Area:	Biodiversity conservation and climate change focal areas	Other (UNDP):	350,000-	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	12,560,000	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE), Thailand	Total Project Cost:	14,318,182-	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		27 February 2012
		Operational Closing Date:	Proposed: 26 June 2017	Actual:

PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

This project's objective is to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up integrated Community Based Forestry and Catchment Management (CBFCM) practices through innovative financing mechanisms. The project will achieve this objective by strengthening systemic capacities in sustainable forest and catchment management at the local, regional and national levels (Outcome 1), and by supporting the expansion of CBFCM coverage throughout the

country through pilot testing of defined Payment for Environmental Services (PES) and bi-ocarbon financing mechanisms (Outcome 2).

The project will build capacities of MONRE to harmonise policies, plans and legal instruments to support CBFCM and PES and biocarbon schemes. It will also support the establishment of a multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM, with active with participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, REOs, ONEP and RFD. This will act as an effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing and capacity development mechanism. The project will also strengthen national capacities to promote PES (including and biocarbon) in order to strengthen community incentives for effective forest and catchment management.

The project will support scaling up of CBFCM best practices using PES and biocarbon financing mechanisms at four sites, led by four Regional Environment Offices (REOs). These sites include Mae Sa Catchment (North), Tha Chin Catchment (Central), Lam Sebai Catchment (Northeast), and Pa-Ngan Catchment (South). The project will strengthen capacities of local authorities, landholders and the private sector to ensure that innovative financing mechanisms (PES) is used for improving livelihoods, global biodiversity conservation benefits and GHG emission reduction from land use and land use changes. In order to do this, the project will support catchment level ecosystem services valuation (incl. biocarbon) and assessment of benefits, trade-offs and various opportunity costs of land-use options taking into full account the ecosystem services. Biodiversity friendly PES & biocarbon financing strategies will be implemented, with institutionalization of payment distribution structures that fully consider gender and other social equity aspects.

The total project budget is USD. 14,318,182. The allocated resources including the co-financing amount are as follows:

- GEF USD 1,758,182
- MONRE USD 12,210,000
- UNDP USD 350,000

The project will be executed through UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) as the Implementing Partner (IP). At the central level, Pollution Control Department under MONRE's Office of Permanent Secretary had served as the focal point of the project and the project management unit from February 2012 to August 2015. In August 2015, the REOs and the project management unit had been shifted to report instead to the Office of Permanent Secretary, under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.

At the site level, Regional Environmental Offices (REO) will be the focal points in each pilot site. REO 1 will lead the Northern cluster; REO 12 will lead the North-eastern cluster; REO 5 will lead the Central cluster; REO 14 will lead the Southern cluster.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of projects results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[18] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEFfinanced Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with (*Annex C* this TOR). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Thailand including the project sites in:

- Mae Sa Catchment (North), Chiang Mai Province
- Tha Chin Catchment (Central)
- Lam Sebai Catchment (Northeast), Ubol Ratchathani Province
- Pa-Ngan Catchment (South), Surat Thani Province

At the four pilot sites, key stakeholders include REOs, the local government, forest and protected areas authorities as well government agencies on agriculture, industries and coastal and marine resources management.

Interviews will be held with the following personnel and organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project Director
- Project Manager
  - Representative of Responsible Parties, including:
- Head of Corporate Communications, SCCC Public Co., Ltd.
  - Forestry Faculty, Kasetsart University abd Project Consultant (Policy Framework) RECOFTC
- Field Officers
- Representatives from pilot communities
- Project Administrative Officer
- Project Financial Officer
- Members of Project Board
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok in-charge of this project.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other

[18] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference. The full scope methods used in the evaluation are at the discretion of the evaluator(s), but a mixed method of document review, interviews, and direct observations should be employed, at a minimum. The TE inception report and TE report should explain all the evaluation methods used in detail.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework), which (see Annex A provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA & EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	***rating***	**4. Sustainability**	***rating***
Relevance		Financial resources	
Effectiveness		Socio-political	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
In-kind support								
Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[19]

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Thailand. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

[19] A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: ROTI Handbook 2009

The total duration of the evaluation will be *29* days over a time period from 1 May to 30 July 2017 according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Tentative Period
Preparation	4 working days	*1-4 May 2017*
Evaluation Mission	17 working days (Monday-Friday); per diem will be paid on working days and over the weekends.	*29 May to 2 June 2017;* *5-9 June 2017;* *12-16 June 2017* *19-20 June 2017* *Note: 20 June 2017 (briefing)*
Draft Evaluation Report	6 working days	*23-30 June 2017*
Final Report	2 working days	*17-18 July 2017*

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: *5 May 2017*	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: 20 June 2017	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 1 week after the evaluation mission: *30 June 2017*	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: *18 July 2017*	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See Annex H for an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *an international and a national evaluator*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The team members must present the following qualifications:

A. INTERNATIONAL LEAD CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-Graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of 8 years accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation areas, and sustainable livelihoods (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)
- Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of INTEGRATED COMMUNITYBASED FOREST AND CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT THROUGH AN ECOSYSTEM SERVICE APPROACH

IS an advantage (5%).

- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation projects
- Comprehensive knowledge of international biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation best practices (15%)
- Excellent written English (20%)

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review
- Leading the TE Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Terminal Evaluation Report

B. NATIONAL CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)
- Eight (8) years of project development and implementation (20%)
- Some project management experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation (10%) would be an advantage.
- Multilateral and bilateral funded project development and implementation
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects (20%)
  Excellent in written and spoken English (10%)

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of inception report
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template[20] provided by UNDP;
b) CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form[21]);
c) Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

[20] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmati on%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

[21] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Annex 2 Itinerary

Integrated Community-Based Forest and Catchment Management (CBFCM)

Terminal Review Mission

Date and Time	Meetings	Focal Points/Notes
Mon 29 May 09.30 hrs.	**Opening meeting at UNDP Thailand Country** **Location :Yangtze meeting room, United Nations Service Building** Mr .Pawin Talengsri, Programme Analyst, UNDP Ms .Nisakorn Puangkamalard, Programme Associate, UNDP Thailand Mr. Pituck Jongnarangsin, UNDP-GEF Portfolio Consultant	***Contact persons: UNDP*** *Ms..Nisakorn Puangkamalard* *02-3049100 ext 2134*
13.30 hrs. 13.30-15.00 hrs. 15.00-16.00 hrs. 16.00-17.00 hrs.	**Meeting with Project Director and PMU** **Location :Office of Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment on Rama 6, Bangkok** Meeting Room :16th Floor, OPS, MONRE • Mrs .Aree Wattana Tummakird, Project Manager • Mr .Amnat Thongben, Director of Office of Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and Project Director • Mr .Kantapan Pisalsukskul, Chief of OPS, MONRE Overnight in Bangkok) Royal Princess Lanlaung (	***Contact person: CBFCM*** *Mrs.AreeWattana Tummakird* *Project Manager, CBFCM* *089-204-6443*
Tue 30 May 9.00-10.30 hrs. 10.30-12.00 hrs. 13.30-14.15 hrs. 14.15-15.00 hrs. 15.00-15.45 hrs.	Interviews consultants and other stakeholders at the Office of Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment on Rama 6, Bangkok Meeting Room :16th Floor, OPS , MONRE Interviewees : • Interview with Mr .Kitichai Rattana, Environmental Policy and Institutional Consultant • Mr .Somkid Phumkokrux, Geographical Data Consultant Lunch at canteen on the ground floor of PCD Building. • Interview with representative from CATSPA • Interview with representative from BEDO • Interview with representative from ECO-BEST Overnight in Bangkok) Royal Princess Lanlaung(	***Contact person: CBFCM*** *Mrs.AreeWattana Tummakird* *Project Manager, CBFCM* *089-204-6443*

Date and Time	Meetings	Focal Points/Notes
Wed 31 May 12.00-13.30 hrs. 13.30-15.00 hrs. 15.00-16.30 hrs.	Interview with CBFCM Project consultants at MONRE • Mr .Udomsak Seelprachawong Economist Consultant • Ms .Somying Soontornwong Social and Community Consultant Overnight in Bangkok) Royal Princess Lanlaung(	*Mrs. Aree Wattana Tummakird, Project Manager, CBFCM* *(M) 089-204-6443*
Thu 1 June 7.00 hrs. 9.00-9.10 hrs. 9.10-9.30 hrs. 9.30-10.00 hrs. 10.00-12.00 hrs. 12.00-13.00 hrs. 13.00-15.00 hrs.	**<u>Tha Chin Catchment</u>** Travel to Mangrove Forest Learning and Development Centre 2, Samutsakorn Province) Van organized by UNDP(Welcoming Remarks by Ms .Eak-on Keawkhao)on behalf of Ms .Pusadee Yeamsawat, Director of REO5(Introduction to Team Work of Tha Chin Cacthment by REO5 Evaluators inform the objective and the process of terminal evaluation REO 5 present the result of the project implementation Lunch to be organized by REO5 Interview with representatives from Government Sectors and TAOs: Topic: :Tha Chin Estuary Ecosystems and Change of Mangrove Areas and the Upper Gulf of Thailand • Mr .Samanjai Mansilp Director of Mangrove Forest Learning and Development Centre 2 • Mr .Tawin Tongsin Director of Public Works Section from Bangyaphrak District/Working Group • Ms .Mallika Netlomwong Director of public works section from Khokkham District /Working group • Ms. Yaowapa Onwan	**Contact persons)REO5:(** Ms .Eak-on Keawkha M. 086-389-5749 Email:Eak_onk@hotmailcom)Tel(. 034-498263

	Public Works Section, Pantainorasing sub-district • Mr. Surin Rahong Representative from Bangyaphrak sub-district/KM of community with Coastal Protection Overnight at Bansouynamsai Resort, Samutsakorn http//:www.bannsouynamsai.com/ Room rate :THB .1,200 per room per night	
Fri 2 June 9.00-12.00 hrs .	Interviews with community representatives on activities Related on ecosystem services Topic :Resources and conservation in Phittayalongkorn Canal)CBFCM Project in Tha Chin Catchment(• Ms .Tanatip Chuathin Representatives from Bangyaphrak District /community • Ms .Saard Suaseenual Representatives from Bangyaphrak District /community • Ms .Aree Kongklad Representatives from Khokkham District /community • Mr. Rewat Loewanitwong Water Quality Check Group Pantainorasing sub-district • Mrs .Sujitra Chainamwongdech Representatives from Pantainorasingh District /community • Mr .loephong Gantong Representatives from Khokkham District/KM of community with	)M (099-120-4615)M (085-181-8508)M (087-155-9192 (M) 086-847-7844 (M) 086-524-1021
12.00-13.00 hrs. 13.00-16.00 hrs. 16.00-17.30 hrs.	Lunch to be organized by REO5 Site visit of Tha Chin Estuary Ecosystems Return to Bangkok Overnight in Bangkok (Royal Princess Lanlaung)	(M) 086-524-1021
Sun 4 June 10.20-11.50 hrs.	**Travel to Suratthani province** **A Mr .John Grynderup Poulsen and Ms .Rungsuree Chaikheankaew, Interpreter** Departing Bangkok at 10.20 hrs .by Bangkok Airways by	**Contact person)REO14(** *Ms .Nongyao Yuthachana* *(M)* 081-370-2425

13.00-13.30 hrs.	PG-125 Arriving in Koh Samui at 11.50 hrs. **Ferry to Kho Pha Ngan operated by Seatran Discovery** Departing Bangrak pier at 13.00 hrs. Arriving Thong Sala pier at 13.30 hrs. Overnight on Koh Pha Ngan Island Transfer to the hotel by hotel limousine .Accommodation to be booked by REO14	
16.25-17.35 hrs.	**B. Ms .Walaitat Worakul)National Evaluator (** Departing Bangkok at 16.25 hrs .by Nokair by DD7162 Arriving in Suratthani at 17.35 hrs. Overnight in Suratthani. Accommodation to be booked by REO14	
Mon 5 June 09.30-16.00 hrs.	**<u>Pha Ngan Catchment)Interview in Suratthani(</u>** **Ms .Walaitat Worakul will interview the following at REO Office in Surathani** ***Transport from hotel to REO14 to be organized by REO14*** • Mr .Yongyut Panitaungkul, Director of REO14 • Ms .Jintamard Sinlapaprommard, Environmentalist, Senior Professional Level, REO14	**Contact person)REO14(** *Ms .Nongyao Yuthachana* *)M(* 081-370-2425
Mon 5 June 09.30-12.00 hrs.	**Interview with representative from Local Administrative Organization by Mr .John Grynderup Poulsen and Ms .Rungsuree Chaikheankaew)Interpreter(** • Mr .Thanut Srikaew, Director of Public Health and Environmental Section, Koh Phangan Municipality • Mr .Sarote Parnmart, Director of Public Works Section, Koh Phangan Municipality • *Ms .Nongyao Yuthachana*, Environmentalist, Professional Level, REO14	*)M(* 094-964-4591 *)M(* 089-729-2976
12.00-13.00 hrs.	Lunch on own .REO14 will suggest a restaurant to the evaluation team.	
13.00-14.00 hrs.	erview with representative from local community • Mr .Prapun Deawvanich Head of the village)Moo 1(• Mr .Prakob Rungruang, Head of Naiwok-Suanwad community)Pilot project area(erview with representative from private sectors	*)M(* 081-979-3006 *)M(* 086-289-3468

14.00-15.30 hrs.	• Mr. Ja-ray Pinyosirikul, Director of Phangan Hotel Association • Mr .Tawit Somwang Chief Advisor of Haadrin Bussiness Association	
15.30-17.00 hrs.	Overnight in Phangan	
Tue 6 June 08.00 hrs. 10.00-11.50 hrs.	**Travel from Suratthani to Chiang Mai Province** **)A (Mr .John Grynderup Poulsen and Interpreter** **Ferry to Kho Samui** by Seatran Discovery Departing Thong Sala pier at 08.00 hrs . Arriving Bangrak Pier at 08.30 hrs. Transit to Kho Samui airport PG241 departing Samui at 10.00 hrs . Arriving Chiang Mai at 11.50 hrs. Overnight in Chiang Mai province Check-in at At Pingnakorn Chiangmai Room Rate :THB 1,350 per room)booked by REO1 (	**Contact person)REO1(** Ms .Suwaree Singpetch)M (092-261-8817)M(061-404-6563 E-mail :
Tue 6 June 14.20-15.30 hrs.	**B (Mrs .Walaitat Worakul** Transit flight to Chiang Mai Province by Nokair by DD8316, departing Bangkok at 14.20 hrs . Arriving in Chiang Mai at 15.30 hrs . Khun Walaitat will stay at home .	
Wed 7 June 9.00-10.30 hrs. 13..30-14.30 hrs.	**<u>Mae Sa Catchment,</u>** Interview with representative from government sector • Ms .Suwaree Singpetch Environmentalist, Senior Professional Level • Janunee Phumphuang • Phanmika Daengsiw Interview with Local Administrative Organization • Mr .Wichai Chaiwitnon The Major of Mae Ram Municipality • Mr .Somchit Kantaya The member parliament of Chiang Mai Provincial Administrative Organization	**Contact person)REO1(** Ms .Suwaree Singpetch)M(092-261-8817)M(061-404-6563)M(089-108-8574 (M) 091-069-1103 (M) 081-885-3492

	Overnight in Chiang Mai at At Pingnakorn Hotel	
Thu 8 June 9.00-12.00 hrs. 12.00-13.00 hrs. 13.300-14.30 hrs.	**<u>Mae Sa Catchment</u>** Interview with community • Mr .Sawai Loydee Village Committee Mamber (Moo 6) • Mr .Surasak Inthronsri Head of the Village Moo 9, Mae Raem sub-district Lunch to be organized by REO1 Interview with private sectors • Mr .Phamornchairat Chamnuan Representative from Suan Bua Mae Sa Orchid • Mr .Songsai Maungkarat Representative from Eagle Track zip line ernight in Chiang Mai at At Pingnakorn Hotel	(M) 089-998-2552 (M) 086-182-1685 (M) 088-252-5072
Fri 9 June 9.00-16.00 hrs. 19.20-20.30 hrs.	Mae Sa Catchment Site visit -Living Weir at Mae Ram Village Moo 3 -Living Weir at Pang Hai Village Moo 4 -Experience Mae Sa Catchment Return to Bangkok by Thai Airways by TG 117 departing Chiang Mai at 19.20 hrs .arriving in Bangkok at 20.30 hrs. Overnight in Bangkok	**Contact person)REO1(** Ms .Suwaree Singpetch M. 092-261-8817
Mon 12 June 13.20-14.25 hrs.	**Travel to Ubon Ratchathani province** by Nokair DD9316, departing Bangkok at 13.20 hrs. Arriving in Ubon Ratchathani at 14.25 hrs. REO12 will collect the evaluation team from the airport . Check-in at Hotel Sunee Grand in Ubon Rate :THB 1,000 Baht/room/night	**Contact person (REO12)** Ms. Supaporn Gukamsai *(M) 081-490-2243* *Email:* supaponku@gmail.com
Tue 13 June 09.00-10.30 hrs.	**<u>Lam Sebai Catchment, Ubon Ratchathani province</u>** Location :Regional Environmental Office 12 Interview with representative from government sectors • Mr .Wiroon Rerktanakajjorn Director of REO12	**Contact person (REO12)** Ms. Supaporn Gukamsai *(M) 081-490-2243* *Email:* supaponku@gmail.com

	• Ms .Supaporn Gukamsai Environmentalist, Professional Level	
10.30-12.00 hrs.	Interview with Interview with representative from Private sector • Mr .Wiwat Ratanachumning Manager of S S Alclohal company	
12.00-13.00 hrs.	Lunch	
13.00-14.00 hrs	Interview with Interview with representative from Private sector • Ms .Tassanee Boonsueb Assistant of Organization Communication Manager, Group of Ubon Bio-athanal company	
14.45-15.30 hrs.	Interview with representative from Local Administrative Organization • Permanent Secretary of TAO	
15.30-17.30 hrs.	Travel to community .Car is organized by REO12. erview with representative from community • Mr .Seeha Mongkhonkaeo Chairman of Networking Group of Daong Yai Community Forest Conservation • Mr .Weerachai Manat Member of Networking Group of Daong Yai Community Forest Conservation • Phrakru Sukumwannokpat Director of Bhuda Thum Phrom Wachirayan Centre Overnight at Sunee Grand Hotel in Ubon Ratchathani	
Wed 14 June 09.00-10.00 hrs.	Return to Bangkok by Nokair by DD9313, Departing Ubon Ratchathani at 09.00 hrs . Arriving in Bangkok at 10.00 hrs. Overnight in Bangkok)Hotel in Bangkok to be booked by consultant themselves(	
Thu 15 and Fri 16 June	Report preparation by evaluators	
Mon 19 June 10.00 hrs.	Debriefing-UNDP	**Contact person** (**UNDP**) :

		Ms. Nisakorn Puangkamalard 02-304-9100 ext 2134
Tue 20 June 9.00 hrs.	Debriefing and presentation of initial findings to OPS, MONRE Venue :Meeting Room ....., Office of Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)OPS, MONRE(	**Contact person** (**CBFCM**) Mrs. Aree Wattana Tummakird, Project Manager, CBFCM *(M) 089-204-6443*

Evaluation Team Members:

Mr. John Grynderup Poulsen (International Team Leader)
Email: JGPoulsen@hotmail.com
Mrs. Walaitat Worakul (National Evaluator):
Email : walaitat@hotmail.com Mobile: 095-669-7955
Interpreter: Ms. Roongsuree Chaikheankaew
Email : randolene@hotmail.com Mobile: 081 821 9898
Driver on May 29 - 31, 2017 and June 1 - 2, 2017: Mr. Panya Mobile: 0815595609

Annex 3 List of persons interviewed

No	Name	Organization/Position
1	Mr. Amnat Thongben	Project Director, MONRE
2	Mr. Katapan Pisalsukskul	Project Co-Manager, MONRE
3	Mr. Kittichai Rattana	Project Consultant (Policy and Institution Reform)
4	Mr. Somkid Phumkokrux	Project Consultant (Geographical Data)
5	Mr. Udomsak Seelprachawong	Project Consultant (Economist)
6	Ms. Somying Soontornwong	Project Consultant (Social and Community Development)
7	Mr. Komkrit Sethabupha	CATSPA Project (DNP)
8	Former Project coordinator	ECO-BEST Project (GIZ-DNP)
9	Mr. Cherdchai Jariyapanya	Director of Office of Natural Resources and Environment, Samutsakorn Province
10	Mr. Chaiwat Tongklin	Provincial Internal Security Command Office
11	Ms. Jarupan Hongsawat	Environmental Specialist, REO 5
12	Ms. Eak-on Keawkhao	Environmentalist, REO 5
13	Mr. Tawin Tongsin	Director of Public Works Section, Bangyaphrak TAO
14	Ms. Mallika Netlomwong	Director of Public Works Section, Khokkham TAO
15	Ms. Yaowapa Onwan	Director of Public Works Section, Phantainorasing TAO
16	Mr. Surin Rahong	Knowledge Management Network, Bangyaphrak
17	Ms. Tanatip Chuathin	Representative from Bangyaphrak community
18	Ms. Saard Suaseenual	Representative from Bangyaphrak community
19	Ms. Aree Kongklad	Representative from Khokkham community
20	Mr. Rewat Loewanitwong	Member, Water Quality Inspection Group, REO 5
21	Ms. Sujitra Chainamwongdech	Representative from Phantainorasing community
22	Mr. Loepong Gantong	Representative from Khokkham community
23	Mr. Yongyut Panitaungkul	Director, REO 14
24	Ms. Jintamard Sinlapaprommard	Senior Environmentalist, REO 14
25	Mr. Thanut Srikaew	Director, Public Health Section, Koh Pha Ngan Municipality
26	Mr. Sarote Parnmart	Director, Public Works Section, Koh Pha Ngan Municipality
27	Ms. Nongyao Yuthachana	Environmentalist, REO 14
28	Mr. Prapun Deawvanich	Head of Village #1, Koh Pha Ngan
29	Mr. Prakob Rungruang	Head of Naiwok-Suanwad community, Koh Pha Ngan
30	Ms. Suwaree Singpetch	Senior Environmentalist, REO 1
31	Mr. Wichai Chaiwitnom	Mayor, Mae Raem Municipality
31	Mr. Somchit Kantaya	Member of PAO, Chaing Mai
32	Mr. Surasak Inthronsri	Head, Village #9, Mae Raem Sub-district

33	Mr. Sawai Loydee	Village Leader, Village # 6, Mae Raem sub-district
34	Mr. Phamornchairat Chamnuan	Manager, Suan Bua Orchid Farm, Mae Rim, ChiangMai
35	Mr. Songsai Maungkarat	Manager, Eagle Track Zipline, Chaing Mai
36	Mr. Wiroon Rerktanakajjorn	Director, REO 12
37	Ms. Supaporn Gukamsai	Senior Environmentalist, REO 12
38	Mr. Wiwat Ratanachumning	Plant Manager, SS Alcolhol Co. Ltd.
39	Mr. Utai Samlee	Head of Engineering Department, SS Alcolhol Co. Ltd.
40	Mr. Teerasak	Staff, SS Alcolhol Co. Ltd.
41.	Ms. Tassanee Bunsueb	Ubon Bio-ethanol company
42	Permanent Secretary	Hua Don TAO, Ubonratchatanee
43	Mr. Seeha Mongkhonkaew	Chairman, Dongyai Community Forest Committee
44	Mr. Weerachai Mana	Member, Dongyai Community Forest Committee
45	Mr. Somkiat	Member, Dongyai Community Forest Committee

Annex 4 List of documents reviewed

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
- Project Implementation Plan
- Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
- Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
- Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
- Project budget and financial data
- Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
- UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives
- Project Inception report
- Annual work plans
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
- Oversight mission reports/BtORs/ monitoring reports
- Project Steering Committee reports
- Audit reports with follow up action plans
- Combined Delivery Reports

Annex 5 Evaluation Question Matrix

CRITERIA/ SUB-CRITERIA	MAIN QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE EVALUATION	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
RELEVANCE				
1 Project design as a tool to address identified threats and barriers	• Does the project reflect the specific needs of Thailand?	• Project design in response to identified threats and barriers	• Relevant documents. • Project Document and related documentation • UNDAF, CCA	• Documents review • Consultations with UNDP CO
2 Alignment of project with GEF global priorities	• Is the project in line with the relevant GEF Operational Programme and strategic priorities?	• Match or mis-match between project products and the GEF relevant strategic objectives	• Relevant documentation • UNDP/GEF RTA	• Documents review • Consultations with RTA and others
EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT				
1 Progress toward achievement of the Objective and Outcomes	• Did the project implementation across all its activities contribute to progress toward the stated outcomes and objective? • What are the remaining gaps and priorities in progress towards achievement of the project outcomes and objective, both immediate and longer term? • What are the reasons for success in reaching/ exceeding Mid-Term targets? • What are the reasons/ challenges in slower-than-expected progress? • How can achievements be sustained and reinforced?	• Achievement of, or progress towards objective and outcomes with reference to SMART indicators • Influences on the level of achievement • Prospects for sustainability	• PIRs • Local communities/beneficiaries • PMU self-assessment	• Documents review • Consultations in the field • Consultations with Stakeholders
EFFICIENCY				
1 Managerial efficiency (execution efficiency)	• Has the project been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates? • Have UNDP and other partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues? • Did the project implementation place an undue burden on some partners? • Have the Risks been avoided or mitigated? • How has adaptive management been reported by the Project Team and shared with the Project Board? • How have any lessons from adaptive management been documented and incorporated into project management? • Is internal and external communication with project and national stakeholders regular and effective?	• Project extensions, cost over-runs • Delivery rate • Risk management strategy • Examples of Adaptive Management and its benefits • Communication efficiency	• Relevant documents especially PB Minutes, PIRs, Annual Reports, etc • PMU self-assessment • Beneficiaries consultations	• Documents review • Consultations with PMU and UNDP CO staff • Consultations with EAs • Consultations with beneficiaries

CRITERIA/ SUB-CRITERIA	MAIN QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE EVALUATION	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
2 Programmatic efficiency (implementation efficiency)	• Were the project resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?	• Focus of project activities; project design • Involvement, ownership • Partner satisfaction or disappointment with arrangements	• ProDoc • Annual Work Plans • PIRs • UNDP CO • UNDP/GEF RTA • Donor reports and consultations	• Documents review • Consultations with PMU and UNDP CO • Consultations with donor partners and implementation partners
3 Financial management and cost-effectiveness	• Are financial controls, allowing transparent decision-making and timely flow of funds, well established? • Are funds well-managed? • Have there been any well-justified budget revisions, based on evidence from reporting? • What co-financing has been mobilised since inception, and what (if any) additional funds have been leveraged? • What are the efficient, including cost-effective ways of moving forward after the project's mid-term? • What are the good practices of implementation or in delivering results?	• Efficiency and prudence in budget management	• Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports, • PSC Meeting minutes • PIRs	• Documents review • Consultations with PMU and UNDP CO
SUSTAINABILITY				
1 Design for Sustainability	• Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks? • Did the project's communication strategy enhance the chances for sustainability?	• Sustainability Plan/Exit Strategy	• ProDoc and project design • PIRs	• Review of relevant documentation
2 Issues at implementation and corrective measures	• What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? • What were the corrective measures that were adopted?	• Reviews of LogFrame • Examples of adaptive management	• Various project documentation • Project Manager • PMU self-assessment?	• Documents review • Project Manager • Stakeholders at country level
3 Sustainability strategy	• Have the heirs to the project been identified and prepared?	• Arrangements in place for the transition	• PMU and PIRs • Prospective heirs	• Consultations with PMU, UNDP and "inheriting" parties, especially DNP
UNDP PROGRAMMING PRINCIPLES				
1. Gender equity	• How well are gender issues identified and addressed in the project's design and implementation?	• Adequate attention and meaningful actions towards gender equity	• Various project reports • Various project implementers and stakeholders	• Documents review • Stakeholders • PSC members
2. Poverty, inequalities and exclusion	• Has the project identified and addressed poverty issues and lack of opportunity (if relevant)?	• Assessment of opportunities within project design	• PSC meeting minutes • Project Annual Reports • PIRs	• Documents review • Consultations at community level

CRITERIA/ SUB-CRITERIA	MAIN QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE EVALUATION	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
		Adequate attention and meaningful actions		
3. **Disaster Preparedness**	• Does the project address disaster risk reduction, or climate change mitigation and adaptation (if relevant)?	• Assessment of opportunities within project design • Adequate attention and meaningful actions	• Project Annual Reports • PIRs	• Documents Review • Consultations with UNDP CO
4. **Capacity development**	• Does the project discuss strengthening of national capacities, or other aspects of capacity development?	• Adequacy of capacity development to ensure sustainability	• Project Annual Reports • PIRs	• Documents review

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance			
Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?			
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity and climate change focal area?			
Is the project relevant to Thailand's environment and sustainable development objectives/policies?			
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?			
Is the project internally coherent in its design?			
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?			
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?			
Effectiveness			
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?			
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?			
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?			
Efficiency			
Was project support provided in an efficient way?			
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project			
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?			

What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?			
Sustainability			
Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?			
What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?			
Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?			
Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?			
Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared?			
Is there evidence that financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed?			
Impact			
Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements?			
Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems?			
Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?			

Annex 6: Terminal GEF Tracking Tool (provided in a separate file)

Annex 7 Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded .
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results .
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants .They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage .Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source .Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations .Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body .Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported .
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders .In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality .They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation .Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders 'dignity and self-worth .
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product)s .(They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations .
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System
Name of Consultant: Ms. Walaitat Worakul
Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): (n.a.)
I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.
Signed at Chiang Mai, Thailand on 4 July 2017

Signature: 

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[5]

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: JOHN GAYNDERUP POULSEN

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): N/A

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: John G Poulsen

[5] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex 8 Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by
UNDP Country Office
Name: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA
Name: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____