



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

GEF ID:	5726		
Country/Region:	Thailand		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management Models for Local Government Organisations to Enhance Biodiversity Protection and Utilization in Selected Eco-regions of Thailand		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5271 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$67,580	Project Grant:	\$1,758,904
Co-financing:	\$7,530,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,356,484
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Johan Robinson

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated 04/18/2013	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes. Aligned with BD-2. In addition, the project will contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets, in particular under the strategic goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use, Target 5: the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced; Target 7: areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; Target 8: reduction of pollution to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem functions and biodiversity; and Target 12: preventing extinction of known threatened species.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes. The project is fully aligned with Thailand's "National Policies, Measures and Plans on the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Biodiversity (2008 – 2012)" which is the country's NBSAP.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> • Assess whether the project is	03/19/2014 UA: The project is innovative in its incorporation of specific biodiversity targets into management agreements that will create the necessary stimulus for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>local government organisations to create the necessary local incentives and disincentives for local communities and private sector to address biodiversity loss. Social sustainability of the project is ensured through accruing significant socioeconomic benefits at both national and local levels as a result of project interventions. Nationally, the project will secure biodiversity and ecosystem service vital to Thailand's economy. Replication will be achieved through the direct replication and scaling up of sustainable practices and methods demonstrated by the project.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF:</u> Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement:</u> Has co-</p>	<p>03/19/2014 UA: Yes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes. The PPG is within the allowed ceiling and is recommended for approval in line with PIF approval.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	03/19/2014 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends PIF for CEO approval.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 19, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**