

Terminal Evaluation

**Catalyzing the Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System
)CATSPA(
PIMS 3825**

Final Report

**Walaitat Worakul
Andrew Sillitoe**

December 22 2016

ABBREVIATIONS

DNP	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non Government Organisation
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
ProDoc	Project Document
TE	Terminal Evaluation
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Action Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNPAF	United Nations Partnership Framework
PA	Protected Area
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
WWF	World Wildlife Fund
PAC	Protected Area Advisory Committee
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
CATSPA	Catalyzing the Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System
CEO ER	CEO Endorsement Request
MoNRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
TAO	Tambon Administrative Organisation
ER	Endorsement Request
EFCOM	Eastern Forests Complex
AWP	Annual Work Plan
NESBD	National Economic and Social Development Board

CONTENTS

	Page
๑. บทสรุปสำหรับผู้บริหาร (Executive Summary)	i
ตารางสรุปข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับโครงการ	i
คำอธิบายเกี่ยวกับโครงการ	i
ตารางแสดงผลการประเมินโครงการ	ii
ข้อสรุปที่สำคัญ	iii
<i>Project Description</i>	v
<i>Terminal Evaluation Ratings Table</i>	v
<i>Lessons Learned</i>	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. <i>Purpose of the Evaluation</i>	1
B. <i>Scope and Methodology</i>	1
C. <i>Structure of the Terminal Evaluation Report</i>	3
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	3
A. <i>Project Start and Duration</i>	3
B. <i>Context of The Project and Problems it Sought to Address</i>	3
C. <i>Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project</i>	4
D. <i>Baseline Indicators Established</i>	5
E. <i>Pilot Sites</i>	8
F. <i>Main Stakeholders</i>	8
G. <i>Expected Results</i>	8
III. FINDINGS	9
A. <i>Project Design / Formulation</i>	9
B. <i>Project Implementation</i>	13
C. <i>Project Results</i>	17
D. <i>Mainstreaming</i>	29
E. <i>Sustainability</i>	30
F. <i>Impact</i>	31
IV. KEY LESSONS LEARNED	32
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
A. <i>Conclusion</i>	33
B. <i>Recommendations</i>	34
C. <i>Actions to Follow Up or Reinforce Initial Benefits From the Project</i>	34
D. <i>Proposals for Future Directions Underlining Main Objectives, Best and Poor Practice in Addressing Issues Relating to Relevance, Performance and Success</i>	35

- Annex 1. Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference
- Annex 2. Terminal Evaluation Field Mission Itinerary
- Annex 3. List of people Interviewed
- Annex 4. List of Documents Reviewed
- Annex 5. Evaluation Question Matrix
- Annex 6. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Annex 7. Report Clearance Form

SUMMARY DETAILS OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project:

Catalyzing the Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System (CATSPA)

UNDP and GEF project ID#s:

UNDP Project ID: 3825 (PIMS#)

GEF Project ID: 3517 (PMIS#)

Evaluation time frame: July – October 2016

Date of evaluation report: 20th September 2016 (Draft)

Region and countries included in the project:

Asia and the Pacific; Thailand

GEF Operational Programme/Strategic Programme:

GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity

GEF-4 Strategic Programme: BD-SO2; SP4, SP5

Implementing Partner and other project partners:

Implementation Modality:

National Implementation (NIM)

Implementing Partner:

Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)

Responsible Parties/ Partners:

Terminal Review team members:

Andrew Sillitoe, Walaitat Worakul

๑.บทสรุปสำหรับผู้บริหาร (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)

ตารางสรุปข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับโครงการ				
ชื่อโครงการ: โครงการเร่งเสริมความยั่งยืนของระบบการจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครอง (CATSPA)				
GEF Project ID	๓๘๒๕	งบประมาณ	ณ วันที่อนุมัติโครงการ (USD)	ณ วันสิ้นสุดโครงการ (USD)
UNDP Project ID	๓๕๑๗	งปม. จาก GEF	๓,๓๖๔,๕๔๕	๓,๒๑๑,๑๗๕.๗๐ (โดยประมาณ)
ประเทศ	ไทย	งปม.จากหน่วยงานบริหาร/หน่วยงานดำเนินการ		
ภูมิภาค	เอเชียแปซิฟิก	งปม สมทบจากรัฐบาลไทย	๑๔,๒๐๐,๐๐๐	๑๓,๒๑๐,๖๖๕.๙๔
สาขา	ความหลากหลายทางชีวภาพ	งปม. สมทบจากหน่วยงานอื่น: UNDP		๔๙,๖๙๓.๕๗
โปรแกรม	GEF 4 SO1-SP1	งปม สมทบทั้งสิ้น	๑๔,๒๐๐,๐๐๐	๑๓,๒๖๐,๓๕๙.๕๑
หน่วยงานดำเนินงาน	กรมอุทยานแห่งชาติ สัตว์ป่าและพันธุ์พืช	งปม รวมทั้งโครงการ	๑๗,๕๖๔,๕๔๕	๑๖,๔๗๑,๖๓๕.๒๑
หน่วยงานร่วมอื่น ๆ		วันที่ลงนามในเอกสารโครงการ	๒๗ กันยายน ๒๕๕๓	
		วันที่สิ้นสุดการดำเนินงานโครงการ	ตามเอกสารโครงการ: ๑ กันยายน ๒๕๕๖	ตามจริง:

คำอธิบายเกี่ยวกับโครงการ

วัตถุประสงค์ของโครงการตามที่ระบุไว้ในเอกสารโครงการ (Project Document) คือ เพื่อจัดปัจจัยที่เป็นอุปสรรคต่อความยั่งยืนของพื้นที่คุ้มครองในประเทศไทยทั้งระบบด้วยการพัฒนารูปแบบการบริหารที่มีประสิทธิภาพและรูปแบบการจัดการด้านการเงินที่ยั่งยืนสำหรับพื้นที่คุ้มครอง โครงการมุ่งสร้างความสามารถและความมั่นใจของผู้มีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องในการบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองและสนับสนุนงบประมาณสำหรับการทดลองนวัตกรรมในการบริหารพื้นที่คุ้มครองและการจัดการด้านการเงิน นอกจากนี้ยังมุ่งสนับสนุนการพัฒนาแบบเร่งรัดและระบบติดตามผลที่เหมาะสม ตลอดจนการมีส่วนร่วมของชุมชนในกิจกรรมอนุรักษ์ การแก้ไขข้อจำกัดในการบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองอย่างเป็นระบบจะดำเนินการในระดับกรม/ส่วนกลาง

ในขณะที่กิจกรรมสาธิตทดลองรูปแบบการบริหารพื้นที่คุ้มครองและการจัดการการเงินที่ยั่งยืนจะดำเนินการในระดับพื้นที่ ตัวอย่างกิจกรรมสาธิต/ทดลอง ได้แก่การพัฒนาารูปแบบ ใหม่ ๆ ที่มีประสิทธิภาพ ในการบริหารพื้นที่คุ้มครอง การยกระดับการมีส่วนร่วมของชุมชนและผู้มีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องจากภาคส่วนต่าง ๆ ในการจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครอง การพัฒนารูปแบบการระดมทุนจากแหล่งต่าง ๆ ที่มีความหลากหลายโดยมีการจัดทำแผนการจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองและการจัดการงบประมาณบนฐานของความรู้และข้อมูลเป็นเครื่องมือสนับสนุน

โครงการได้รับการสนับสนุนงบประมาณทั้งสิ้น ๑๗,๕๖๔,๕๔๕ เหรียญสหรัฐ โดยเป็นงบประมาณจาก GEF ๓,๓๖๕,๕๔๕ เหรียญ และงบประมาณสมทบจากรัฐบาลไทย ๑๔,๒๐๐,๐๐๐ เหรียญ
ตารางแสดงผลการประเมินโครงการ

คำอธิบายเกณฑ์ที่ใช้ในการประเมินผลในแต่ละประเด็นตามที่ GEF กำหนด

เกณฑ์

คำอธิบาย

เกณฑ์สำหรับประสิทธิผล ประสิทธิภาพ การบริหารจัดการ และการติดตามประเมินผล

HS (Highly Satisfactory)

โครงการไม่มีข้อบกพร่องในการบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์ในส่วนที่เกี่ยวข้องกับ ประสิทธิภาพ ประสิทธิภาพ และความสอดคล้องกับสภาพปัญหา/นโยบาย

S (Satisfactory)

มีข้อบกพร่องแต่เป็นเรื่องที่ไม่สำคัญ

MS (Moderately Satisfactory)

มีข้อบกพร่องในระดับปานกลาง

MU (Moderately Unsatisfactory)

มีข้อบกพร่องในเรื่องที่สำคัญ

U (Unsatisfactory)

มีข้อบกพร่องอย่างมากในเรื่องประสิทธิภาพ ประสิทธิภาพ และความสอดคล้องกับสภาพปัญหา/นโยบายจนทำให้โครงการไม่สามารถบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์

HU (Highly Unsatisfactory)

โครงการมีข้อบกพร่องที่รุนแรงมาก

ความสอดคล้องกับนโยบาย

R (Relevant)

สอดคล้อง

NR (Not relevant)

ไม่สอดคล้อง

ความยั่งยืน

L (Likely)

มีปัจจัยที่จะทำให้ไม่ยั่งยืนแต่เพียงเล็กน้อย

ML (Moderately Likely)

มีความเสี่ยงที่จะไม่ยั่งยืนในระดับปานกลาง

MU (Moderately Unlikely)

มีความเสี่ยงที่จะไม่ยั่งยืนในระดับสูง

U (Unlikely)

มีความเสี่ยงที่จะไม่ยั่งยืนในระดับรุนแรง

ตารางแสดงผลการประเมิน			
๑. การติดตามและประเมินผล	ผลการประเมิน	๒. การบริหารโดยหน่วยบริหารและหน่วยดำเนินการ	ผลการประเมิน
รูปแบบการติดตามประเมินผลที่กำหนดไว้ในกรอบโครงการ	U	หน่วยดำเนินงาน (UNDP)	MS
รูปแบบระหว่างการทำงาน	MS	หน่วยบริหารโครงการ (กรมอุทยานฯ)	MS
คุณภาพการติดตามและประเมินผลโดยรวม	MS	คุณภาพการบริหารจัดการโครงการโดยรวม	MS
๓. การประเมินผลลัพธ์	ผลการประเมิน	๔. ความยั่งยืน	ผลการประเมิน
ความสำคัญ/สอดคล้องกับนโยบาย (Relevance)	R	ความเสี่ยงด้านงบประมาณ	L
ประสิทธิผล (Effectiveness)	MS	ความเสี่ยงด้านเศรษฐกิจและสังคม	L
ประสิทธิภาพ (Efficiency)	MS	ความเสี่ยงด้านกรอบนโยบายและระบบบริหาร	L

		ขององค์กร	
การประเมินผลสัมฤทธิ์โดยรวม	MS	ความเสี่ยงด้านสิ่งแวดล้อม	L
		ความเสี่ยงโดยรวม	L

ข้อสรุปที่สำคัญ

- (๑) วัตถุประสงค์ของโครงการกำหนดไว้ว่า “เพื่อขจัดปัจจัยที่เป็นอุปสรรคต่อความยั่งยืนของพื้นที่คุ้มครองในประเทศไทยทั้งระบบด้วยการพัฒนารูปแบบการบริหารที่มีประสิทธิผลและรูปแบบการจัดการด้านการเงินที่ยั่งยืนสำหรับพื้นที่คุ้มครอง” การดำเนินงานไม่สามารถบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์ของโครงการได้ทั้งหมด มีการวางแผนกิจกรรมเพื่อปรับปรุงการบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองทั้งในส่วนกลางและในพื้นที่สาธิต กิจกรรมส่วนหนึ่งสามารถดำเนินงานได้สำเร็จเป็นที่น่าพอใจ ได้แก่การทดลองรูปแบบการบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองในลักษณะกลุ่มป่า การพัฒนาและขยายผลการลาดตระเวนเชิงคุณภาพทางบก การทดลองรูปแบบการลาดตระเวนเชิงคุณภาพทางทะเล การจัดทำแผนการจัดการอุทยานแห่งชาติแบบบูรณาการ (แผน ๒๐ ปี) เป็นต้น นอกจากนี้ยังมีกิจกรรมเสริมสร้างศักยภาพในการจัดการและการบริหารการเงินสำหรับพื้นที่คุ้มครอง เช่นการจัดทำแผนธุรกิจในบางพื้นที่สาธิตทดลองและการอบรมเกี่ยวกับการบริหารการเงินสำหรับเจ้าหน้าที่กรมอุทยานฯ ส่วนการพัฒนากลไกทางการเงินจากแหล่งเงินนอกงบประมาณนั้นแม้จะมีการวางระบบไว้แล้วใน ๒ พื้นที่แต่ยังไม่ได้เริ่มดำเนินการทดลองรูปแบบ (ดูรายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับสถานะของกิจกรรมทั้งหมด ณ วันที่ทำการประเมินผลระยะสิ้นสุดโครงการในโครงการในตารางที่ xxxx)
- (๒) การออกแบบโครงการมีความคาดหวังที่สูงจนเกินไป โครงการมุ่งให้เกิดผลลัพธ์ทั้งในด้านรูปแบบการบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองและรูปแบบการจัดการการเงินที่ยั่งยืนในหลายประเด็นและหลายระดับในระยะเวลาเพียง ๓ ปี นอกจากนี้ในเอกสารโครงการยังไม่ได้ระบุกิจกรรมสำหรับการดำเนินงานให้เป็นไปตามผลลัพธ์อย่างละเอียดและชัดเจน
- (๓) ในภาพรวม กิจกรรมที่มีแผนงานชัดเจนส่วนใหญ่ดำเนินงานได้เสร็จสิ้นตามแผนและผลงานอยู่ในระดับดี อย่างไรก็ตามยังมีโครงการ/กิจกรรมอีกจำนวนหนึ่งซึ่งยังดำเนินการไม่เสร็จและจำเป็นต้องมีการสนับสนุนต่อเนื่องเพื่อให้โครงการสามารถบรรลุผลลัพธ์และวัตถุประสงค์ได้อย่างสมบูรณ์ก่อนวันสิ้นสุดโครงการในเดือนธันวาคม ๒๕๕๙
- (๔) การดำเนินโครงการมีความล่าช้าเนื่องจากระเบียบการทางการเงินและการจัดซื้อจัดจ้างของ UNDP และกรมอุทยานฯ ไม่สอดคล้องกัน และทั้งสองฝ่ายไม่ได้กำหนดแนวทางการดำเนินงานร่วมกันอย่างชัดเจนก่อนจะเริ่มโครงการ แม้ปัญหานี้จะได้รับการคลี่คลายไปในระดับหนึ่งในระหว่างการดำเนินงานแต่ก็ไม่สามารถแก้ไขได้ทั้งหมด ในระหว่างการประเมินผล ทีมประเมินฯ ได้รับข้อมูลว่ายังคงมีอีกหลายกรณีที่ยังไม่ได้รับการแก้ไข
- (๕) ผู้จัดการโครงการและเจ้าหน้าที่ของกรมอุทยานฯ มีความคิดเห็นและแนวทางการทำงานและการแก้ไขปัญหาที่ขัดแย้งกันในหลายประเด็น เจ้าหน้าที่บางส่วนมีความเห็นว่าผู้จัดการโครงการขาดความเข้าใจเกี่ยวกับระเบียบการทางการเงินของราชการ การป้องกันไม่ให้เกิดปัญหาลักษณะขึ้นอีกในอนาคตควรใช้หลายวิธีร่วมกัน เช่นการปรับปรุงกระบวนการคัดเลือกผู้จัดการโครงการ การจัดทำคู่มือระเบียบการทางการเงินและการจัดซื้อจัดจ้างที่ปรับสองระบบให้สามารถดำเนินการร่วมกันได้ รวมถึงการอบรมผู้เกี่ยวข้องในระหว่างการดำเนินงาน หากมีความจำเป็น
- (๖) เนื่องจากมีการโยกย้ายเจ้าหน้าที่ระดับสูงของกรมอุทยานฯ ค่อนข้างบ่อย การให้ความสำคัญต่อโครงการจึงมีความผันแปรตามนโยบายของผู้บริหารแต่ละช่วงตลอดระยะเวลาของโครงการ ในบางช่วงการดำเนินงานของโครงการค่อนข้างล่าช้า ไม่มีความก้าวหน้ามากนัก อย่างไรก็ตามในระดับพื้นที่สาธิตทดลอง เจ้าหน้าที่ค่อนข้างให้ความสำคัญต่อการดำเนินกิจกรรมอย่างต่อเนื่อง แม้ในช่วงที่การสนับสนุนจากผู้บริหารและทีมงานของโครงการในส่วนกลางชะงักหรือล่าช้า
- (๗) โครงการมีความสำเร็จในการพัฒนาและขยายผลรูปแบบการมีส่วนร่วมของผู้มีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องในการบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองทั้งในระดับอุทยานและกลุ่มป่า เจ้าหน้าที่กรมอุทยานฯ และผู้มีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องในท้องถิ่นเห็นตรงกันว่าความร่วมมือและการมีส่วนร่วมของประชาชนที่เข้มแข็งจะทำให้เกิดประโยชน์ต่อทั้งพื้นที่คุ้มครองและชุมชนที่อยู่ใกล้เคียง ทำให้เกิดข้อตกลงที่จะทำงานร่วมกันอย่างต่อเนื่อง นอกจากนี้สำนักงบประมาณได้จัดทำกลไกทางงบประมาณเพื่อสนับสนุนการขยายรูปแบบการบริหารงานแบบกลุ่มป่าไปในพื้นที่อื่น ๆ ของประเทศ ซึ่งสะท้อนให้เห็นถึงความสำเร็จของรูปแบบการจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองที่มีการทดลองในโครงการ จนสามารถนำไปสู่การขยายผลในระบบงบประมาณปกติของราชการได้

ข้อเสนอแนะ

- (๑) ก่อนที่โครงการจะสิ้นสุดในเดือนธันวาคม ๒๕๕๙ ควรมีการประชุมเชิงปฏิบัติการจัดทำแผนที่ทางเดิน (Road Map) ของโครงการเพื่อสรุปผลสำเร็จที่เกิดขึ้นและวางแผนสำหรับการดำเนินการต่อเนื่องเพื่อให้ผลผลิตและผลลัพธ์ของโครงการเกิดความยั่งยืนและมีการขยายผลหรือต่อยอดโดยใช้ข้อมูลที่ได้จากการสรุปบทเรียนจากโครงการ ผู้เข้าร่วมประชุมควรประกอบด้วยเจ้าหน้าที่กรมฯ ที่มีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องกับการบริหารและดำเนินงาน

- โครงการ ผู้เกี่ยวข้องอื่น ๆ ภายใต้แต่ละผลลัพธ์ (ระดับกรมฯและพื้นที่) ผู้แทนคณะกรรมการบริหารโครงการ และ UNDP
- (๒) เพื่อให้สามารถดำเนินงานตาม Road Map ได้ จำเป็นต้องมีข้อตกลง/พันธะสัญญาการสนับสนุนด้านงบประมาณและวิชาการทั้งจากภาครัฐ ภาคเอกชน รวมถึงแหล่งทุนอื่น ๆ อย่างเพียงพอ
 - (๓) ควรมีการขยายผลรูปแบบการบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองในลักษณะ 'กลุ่มป่า' (Complex Forest) ไปยังพื้นที่คุ้มครองอื่น ๆ ในประเทศไทย ด้วยการสนับสนุนกลไกทางงบประมาณจากสำนักงานงบประมาณ การประชุมจัดทำ Road Map เป็นโอกาสที่จะได้วางแผนการขยายผลในเรื่องนี้ อย่างเป็นรูปธรรม
 - (๔) ควรมีการจัดทำคู่มือเกี่ยวกับระเบียบการทางการเงินและการจัดซื้อจัดจ้างเพื่อเป็นแนวทางสำหรับเจ้าหน้าที่ที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการดำเนินงาน คู่มือดังกล่าวควรเกิดจากการปรึกษาหารือและข้อตกลง ร่วมกันระหว่างทุกฝ่ายที่เกี่ยวข้อง
 - (๕) ในอนาคต กรมอุทยานฯควรพิจารณาจัดตั้งหน่วยงานพิเศษ Special Delivery Unit เพื่อรับผิดชอบการดำเนินงานโครงการความช่วยเหลือจากภายนอกเพื่อให้มีประสิทธิภาพและประสิทธิผลลดลดจน ความยั่งยืนของผลลัพธ์ที่เกิดจากโครงการ
 - (๖) การคัดเลือกผู้จัดการโครงการสำหรับโครงการในอนาคตควรพิจารณาจากประสบการณ์และความรู้เกี่ยวกับระบบการเงินและการทำงานทั้งของ UNDP และราชการ
 - (๗) ตามระเบียบของกรมอุทยานฯ การเชิญบุคคลภายนอกที่ไม่ใช่ข้าราชการเข้าร่วมการประชุมจำเป็นต้องได้รับการอนุมัติจากปลัดกระทรวงทรัพยากรธรรมชาติและสิ่งแวดล้อมซึ่ง ในระหว่างการดำเนินโครงการพบว่า ขั้นตอนการขออนุมัติดังกล่าวใช้เวลาค่อนข้างมากและบางครั้งต้องเลื่อนหรือยกเลิกการประชุมเนื่องจาก ได้รับความอนุมัติไม่ทัน ในอนาคตกรมอุทยานฯควรทำข้อตกลงพิเศษกับสำนักงานปลัดกระทรวงฯ เพื่อให้ขั้นตอน การขออนุมัติดังกล่าวมีความรวดเร็วยิ่งขึ้น
 - (๘) ควรมีการสรุปบทเรียนเกี่ยวกับข้อจำกัดและแนวทางแก้ไขปัญหาในการบริหารจัดการในโครงการนี้เพื่อใช้ เป็นแนวทางสำหรับการบริหารโครงการ "Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex" หรือโครงการ TIGER ซึ่งกรมอุทยานแห่งชาติ สัตว์ป่า และพันธุ์พืช ได้รับการสนับสนุนจาก GEF และ UNDP ระหว่างปี ๒๕๕๘-๒๕๖๒

บทเรียนสำคัญ

- (๑) ในการออกแบบโครงการ ควรกำหนดผลลัพธ์ให้มีความชัดเจนรัดกุมและควรระบุกิจกรรมเพื่อให้ บรรลุผลลัพธ์ไว้เป็นแนวทางเพื่อป้องกันไม่ให้เกิดความคลาดเคลื่อนไปจากแนวคิดในช่วงการ ออกแบบโครงการ ประเด็นนี้มีความจำเป็นอย่างยิ่งสำหรับทีมงานที่ไม่มีประสบการณ์ในการ ดำเนินงานโครงการที่สนับสนุนโดย GEF มาก่อน
- (๒) การเปลี่ยนแปลงบุคลากรในระดับผู้บริหารโครงการของกรมฯ ตลอดระยะเวลาของโครงการทำให้ระดับความ เป็นเจ้าของโครงการในบางช่วงของกรมฯลดลง ทำให้การดำเนินกิจกรรมหลายส่วนต้องล่าช้าหรือหยุดชะงัก ซึ่งส่งผลโดยตรงต่อการบรรลุผลลัพธ์ของโครงการ การสนับสนุนโครงการอย่างจริงจัง/ต่อเนื่องตลอด โครงการโดยผู้บริหารของกรมฯ รวมถึงการจัดตั้งหน่วยงานบริหารโครงการพิเศษที่ขึ้นตรงต่ออธิบดี (Special Delivery Unit) จึงน่าจะเป็นประโยชน์สำหรับโครงการความช่วยเหลือจากภายนอกในอนาคต
- (๓) อุปสรรคและความล่าช้าในการดำเนินงานจะลดลงมากถ้ามีการจัดทำคู่มือระเบียบการทางการเงินและการ ดำเนินงานโครงการสำหรับใช้อ้างอิงตั้งแต่เริ่มโครงการ ขอบข่ายเนื้อหาของคู่มือดังกล่าวควรเป็นไปตาม ข้อตกลงร่วมกันระหว่าง UNDP กับกรมอุทยานฯ และอาจมีความซับซ้อนแตกต่างกันไปในแต่ละโครงการ ขึ้นอยู่กับขอบเขตการดำเนินงานของโครงการนั้น ๆ แต่อย่างน้อยที่สุดควรจะครอบคลุมประเด็นต่อไปนี้
 - (ก) ภาวะเทียบด้านการบริหารการเงิน การทำบัญชี และการเบิกจ่ายงบประมาณของโครงการ
 - (ข) กระบวนการยื่นขอเสนอราคาในการจัดซื้ออุปกรณ์ การจัดการประชุม ฯลฯ
 - (ค) ขั้นตอนการดำเนินงานและการจัดการเกี่ยวกับกิจกรรมในโครงการโดยผู้จัดการโครงการ และเจ้าหน้าที่โครงการ

ความล่าช้าในการอนุมัติและเบิกจ่ายงบประมาณในช่วงกลางโครงการทำให้ไม่สามารถดำเนินงานได้ตาม แผน เวลาในการดำเนินกิจกรรมในพื้นที่สาธิตเหลือน้อยลงและบาง โครงการต้องถูกยกเลิกเพราะทำไม่ทัน ทั้ง ๆที่เป็นโครงการที่มีประโยชน์และมีโอกาสที่จะส่งผลโดยตรงต่อการบรรลุผลลัพธ์ของโครงการ ดังนั้น การมีคู่มือระเบียบการทางการเงินและการดำเนินงานโครงการที่ชัดเจนตั้งแต่ต้นจะมีส่วนช่วยป้องกันไม่ให้เกิดปัญหาหลักขณะนี้ขึ้น
- (๔) ความยุ่งยากในการอนุมัติให้บุคลากรที่มีเจ้าหน้าที่รัฐเข้าร่วมการประชุมที่จัดโดยกรมฯ สามารถ หลีกเลี่ยงได้ด้วยการจัดทำข้อตกลงภายในปรับขั้นตอนการอนุมัติให้น้อยลงและปฏิบัติได้ง่ายขึ้น และอาจขออนุมัติเป็นชุดโครงการ/กิจกรรมในครั้งเดียว เพื่อลดเวลาและความล่าช้าในการอนุมัติ
- (๕) การบริหารจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองที่มีประสิทธิภาพจำเป็นต้องมีความร่วมมือระหว่างหน่วยงาน ราชการ องค์กรพัฒนาเอกชน ภาคธุรกิจ/เอกชน สถาบันวิชาการ ภาคประชาสังคม ตลอดจนชุมชน ในพื้นที่คุ้มครอง โดยแต่ละฝ่ายต้องมีการกำหนดบทบาทและเป้าหมายการดำเนินงานที่ชัดเจน
- (๖) โครงการทดลอง/นำร่องในพื้นที่สาธิตเกิดจากความต้องการและปัญหาที่เฉพาะเจาะจงของแต่ละพื้นที่ จึง เป็นประโยชน์โดยตรงในการเร่งเสริมความสามารถในการจัดการพื้นที่คุ้มครองนั้น ๆ

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Summary Table				
Project Title: Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System				
GEF Project ID	3825		At endorsement)Million USD(At completion)Million USD(
UNDP Project ID	3517	GEF Financing:	3,364,545	Approx. 3,211,275.70
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:	14,200,000	13,210,665.94
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other: UNDP		49,693.57
Operational Programme	GEF 4 SO1-SP1	Total co-financing:	14,200,000	13,260,359.51
Executing Agency:	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation)DNP(Total project cost:	17,564,545	16,471,635.21
Other Partners Involved:	N/A	ProDoc Signature)date project began(:	27 September 2010	
)Operational(Closing Date:	Proposed: 01 September 2013	Actual:

Project Description

The stated aim of the project as set out in the Project Document)ProDoc(was:

"To overcome barriers to effective management and sustained financing of Thailand's protected area system by looking into effective management and sustainable financing of protected areas."

The project also intended to build the confidence and capacity of the PA management authorities and provide them with resources to test innovative PA management and financing schemes. In addition, it aimed to support the development of appropriate incentives, establish an effective monitoring system, and support community participation in conservation efforts. The systemic barriers were to be addressed at the national level, whilst demonstrations of strengthened PA management were established on the ground through sustainable financing at demonstration sites. These demonstrations were to include, for example, developing novel models of PA management, increased participation by local communities and other stakeholders, and mobilization of diversified revenue sources, supported by improved knowledge-based planning and accounting systems.

The total project budget was US\$17,564,545. This was made up of GEF Project Grant US\$3,365,545 and government contribution of US\$14,200,000.

Terminal Evaluation Ratings Table

Evaluation Ratings			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. EA and IA Execution	Rating
M&E Design at Entry	U	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MS
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	Quality of Execution (DNP)	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	L
Effectiveness	MS	Socio-Political	L
Efficiency	MS	Institutional Framework and Governance	L
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	Environmental	L
		Overall Likelihood	L

Main Conclusions

- i. The objective of the project “To overcome barriers to effective management and sustained financing of Thailand’s protected area system” was not fully achieved. Activities to improve management both at central and field level were planned and implemented with a number of notable successes. These include successfully piloting the Forest Complex Protected Area Committees, developing and extending terrestrial SMART Patrol, piloting Marine SMART Patrol, completing the 20 Year Integrated National Park Management Master Plan etc. Activities to enhance financial and management capacity of the DNP were undertaken including formulation of business plans for a number of protected areas and training of DNP staff in financial management. However, the key component of piloting non-government budgeting mechanisms whilst established in two pilots have not yet been operationalized and tried. The activities undertaken within the project and their status at Terminal Evaluation are described in Table 3 below.
- ii. Project design was overly ambitious given the broad set of outcomes in protected area management and protected area financing that the project was tasked to achieve within the initial three-year timetable. This was further compounded by the lack of detailed planning undertaken in the project preparation stages to clearly define project activities to be undertaken during implementation. No details of individual pilot projects were identified and no mechanism for the replication of successful pilot projects was identified in the Project Document.
- iii. Overall, where planned project work has been completed the results have been good. However, there are a number of activities that are unfinished and require further inputs in order complete and consolidate to fully meet the project objectives and outcomes by the close of the project in December 2016.
- iv. Project implementation was delayed due to the incompatibility between the UNDP and DNP’s financial and procurement systems which was not fully identified until the project had been launched. The issues were not fully resolved during the term of the project and the evaluators, during the Terminal Evaluation, were informed of recent individual cases where problems continued to exist.
- v. Conflicts arose between the Project Manager and DNP staff. According to DNP this situation arose through the Project Managers lack of experience and understanding in the government finance system.
- vi. As a result of the high turnover of senior DNP staff, commitment to the project by the DNP was highly variable throughout the implementation period. This resulted in long periods of inaction during some phases of the project. Commitment of senior DNP management staff is essential throughout the project’s implementation if continuous project implementation and the achievement of project results is to be accomplished. At the field level, activities and commitment of project site staff was good overall and they continued to carry the activities during the periods where there was little support from the previous incumbents of the Director General and Project Director positions.
- vii. The project has been successful in enhancing the stakeholder participatory model in Thailand’s PA’s both at the individual PA level and the complex level. As a result of the feedback the evaluation team received from the community and the institutional stakeholders, there was a high level of support for the continuation and extension of regular participatory

planning exercises with DNP over and above those already established under the PAC system.

- viii. DNP, there has been a reported beneficial increase in collaboration and a verbal commitment was made by DNP and those stakeholders interviewed, to continue the working relationship. Furthermore, the Budget Bureau has made a commitment to support and replicate the Protected Area Complex management model to more regions in Thailand thereby reinforcing the project success in the replication of models developed in the project framework for improving protected area management and protected area sustainability.

Main Recommendations

- i. Prior to the end of the project a 'Road Map Workshop' should be convened with the aim of consolidating the project's achievements through the establishment of a 'sustainability plan'. This will be used to identify the next sequence of activities in order to support and roll out further actions based on lessons learned. The workshop delegates should include key DNP staff and stakeholders from each project outcome / individual field project, representatives from the project steering committee and the UNDP.
- ii. In order to undertake the commitments made at the 'Road Map Workshop', sufficient budget and technical support to implement the 'Road Map' should be committed from Government resources, private sector investors and appropriate donors to complete implementation.
- iii. With the support of the Budget Bureau, Area-Based / Complex PA Management should be extended to other locations in Thailand. The 'Road Map Workshop' will be able to provide the initial discussion forum and set the agenda and timetable for this action.
- iv. A 'Project Implementation Rule Book' covering financial disbursement and procurement procedures and which will serve as a guide to staff responsible for project implementation should be drawn up and agreed between the project's implementing parties to better support implementation including the Project Manager selection process.
- v. For future projects, DNP should establish a Special Delivery Unit for project implementation to ensure efficient and effective management of the project and sustainability of its results.
- vi. When appointing a Project Manager for future projects, the person appointed Project Manager should preferably have knowledge of both DNP and UNDP financial and procurement systems.
- vii. DNP regulations require consent to be sought from the Permanent Secretary where non DNP employed persons attend a workshop. During project implementation this was found to be a time consuming process and considerably slowed up the implementation of the training components. To reduce time delays, an agreement should be reached between DNP and the Permanent Secretary with regard to the speedy approval or special arrangement for approval process for non-government participants at project workshops.
- viii. Lessons learnt from this project with regard to management issues, should be taken up by the management team of the UNDP/GEF "Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex", which is also implemented by DNP.
- ix. The lessons learned from the collaborative activities between DNP and local communities should be analysed for 'best practice' and integrated into DNP's working arrangements.

Lessons Learned

The key lessons learned in this project are:

- i. During project design, 'Outcomes' should be defined more precisely and provide more guidance for the implementing team in defining specific project activities in order to avoid mis-interpretation of the original project ideas. This is especially relevant where the implementing team is not experienced in implementing GEF-financed projects.
- ii. The high levels of DNP Senior management staff turnover throughout the project implementation period resulted in periods of low ownership of the project and as a consequence this reduced the projects workflow and outputs. In order to achieve uninterrupted project implementation results, continuous stability of the project management team and senior staff is highly beneficial and the proposed establishment of a 'Special Delivery Unit' would support this approach.

- iii. Difficulties that arose in the project's implementation could have been greatly ameliorated if a 'project implementation rule book' had been in place at the start of the project. For this project the detail provided in the approved ProDoc was not sufficiently detailed to cover all implementation issues that arose. This 'rule book' could be wide ranging depending on the complexities of the individual project. The contents of the 'rule' book' would be agreed between UNDP and DNP and should include, but not be limited to the following rules for financial management, financial accounting and disbursement of project monies; procedures for tendering and equipment purchase, workshop support etc, implementation procedures and working arrangements for the Project Manager and project staff.
- iv. The long delay between project approval and financial disbursement in the second year resulted in there not being enough time to implement all field activities according to the original plan which led to some of the field projects being cancelled despite their promising contribution to the improved PA management. This situation underpins the need for a 'rule book' to be agreed prior to project start.
- v. Difficulties in arranging workshops for non-government participants can be avoided if internal rules governing workshops and the requirements for approvals is simplified and a 'block' system of approvals used. This will avoid the lengthy time delays experienced in the CATSPA project.
- vi. Effective PA management needs collaboration between government agencies, non-government organizations, private sector, academic institutions as well as local communities with clearly defined roles and benchmarking.
- vii. Pilot activities at demonstration sites were considered to be useful and relevant by DNP staff and local stakeholders because they filled in the existing management gaps in each PA.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Evaluation

The Evaluation Terms of Reference state that:

“The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project 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”.

and that

The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. 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, GEF-financed Projects.

The UNDP Evaluation Policy states that:

The Purpose of "Project evaluations (is to) assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes

And goes on to state that:

Project evaluation can be invaluable for managing results, and serves to reinforce the accountability of project managers, COs, PTAs, etc. Additionally, project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes, as well as for strategic and programmatic evaluations and Assessment of Development Results (ADRs), and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge.

The Terms of Reference of the Terminal Evaluation outline the purpose, objective and scope of the evaluation as:

“The purpose of the evaluation is to promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments; to synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities; to provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; to contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit; and to gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities, including harmonization with other UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) outcomes and outputs.”

“The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project 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.”

B. Scope and Methodology

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) was conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the Project-level Evaluation: Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects (2012).

The evaluation team undertaking the TE complied fully with the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators and have provided signed Code of Conduct Agreement Forms in accordance with the ToR. The principles for ensuring the quality, integrity, and independence of the evaluation are presented with the signatures of the evaluators in Annex 6.

The scope of this Terminal Review focused on an assessment and analysis of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of the project. This has covered aspects relating to

project design, monitoring and evaluation, attainment of outcomes, implementation agency and executing agency performance, management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, stakeholder engagement, reporting and communications.

In undertaking this terminal evaluation, the two overarching objectives of the *GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*ⁱ were fully taken into account. These are:

- to promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities, and contribution to global environmental benefits;
- to promote learning, feedback and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as a basis for decision making on policies, strategies, programme management, projects and to improve performance.

The criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability is defined in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (2012). The criteria are described as follows:

- Relevance - *The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.*
- Effectiveness - *The extent to which the development intervention objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Note: Also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgement about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact. Related term: efficacy.*
- Efficiency - *A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.*
- Sustainability - *Measures the extent to which benefits are likely to continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or programme after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.*
- Impact - *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 evaluation 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.*

The Terminal Evaluation was an evidence-based assessment and relied on feedback from persons who have been involved in the design, implementation, and supervision of the project, review of available documents and records, and findings made during field visits.

The project performance was measured against the indicators of the projects' logical framework and various Tracking Tools, supported by other project documentation including the Performance Indicators and Mid Term Review.

The selection of interviewees was based on combined criteria of their different roles in the project and their ground knowledge about the project's implementation process and results. A gender balance principle was also applied where possible. Detailed interviewee list and Evaluation Questions Matrix are provided in Annexes 3 and 5 respectively.

ⁱ GEF (2010) *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010*. Global Environment Facility, Evaluation Office. Evaluation Document No.4, November 2010.

C. Structure of the Terminal Evaluation Report

The structure of the Terminal Evaluation report was determined by the required format provided in the Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation.

The report comprises of six parts:

- Executive Summary in English and Thai providing an overview of the project, the project results and a summary of its potential sustainability.
- Introduction, summarizing the reviews' purpose, scope and methodology.
- Project Description and Development Context - this provides the background to the project, problems the project sought to address, the baseline indicators and expected results.
- Findings - this section contains details of project design and formulation, project implementation, monitoring and evaluation, assessment of the implementing agencies and project results based on relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact.
- Conclusions containing follow up actions and proposals for future direction.
- Annexes including the terminal evaluation Terms of Reference, revised TE monitoring framework, list of persons interviewed, summary of field visits, evaluation question matrix and list of documents reviewed.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

A. Project Start and Duration

The project duration was planned to be implemented over four years (2010-2014). The project received CEO endorsement in September 2009 and the Project Document signed on 27th September 2010.

The Inception Workshop took place in January 2012. Due to the slow start up a no cost extension was approved in 2013 extending the project until December 2015. A second no cost extension was given after the 2015 MTR further extending the project until December 2016. It is expected that the project will end in December 2016.

B. Context of The Project and Problems it Sought to Address

1. Project context

The context in which the project is set is fourfold:

- I. Environmental context – Nine per cent of all species known to science can be found in the country and significant portions of several WWF Ecoregions 200 also fall inside Thailand's territory. In order to conserve its globally and nationally important biodiversity, Thailand started to establish protected areas (PAs) in the 1960s. Currently, the country's protected area system consists of more than 400 PAs, including national parks, wildlife sanctuaries, forest parks, non-hunting areas, botanical gardens, and arboreta, covering approximately 18% of the country's total land area and 8% of its territorial seas.
- II. Policy and legislation context - Thailand's protected area system is largely managed by the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP) under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE). The legal framework for protected area management in Thailand rests on three principal Acts. These are The National Parks Act of 1961, The Wildlife Protection and Preservation Act of 1960 (revised in 1992) and The Natural Forest Reserve Act of 1964. These are supplemented by Acts, Resolutions and Policies important for protected areas management and conservation of biodiversity in Thailand. Furthermore, the Constitution is important as it provides a mandate for radical reform of the governance system and for management and governance of rural natural resources with participation of the people.
- III. Institutional context - DNP has the mandate and jurisdiction for management of protected areas in Thailand consisting of 13 divisions/offices at the national level and 21 sub-national (regional) offices. Local governments (Tambon Administrative Organizations - TAOs) located within or immediately around PAs are mandated to undertake local environmental planning and management, as well as developing local infrastructure and spatial planning. They receive 5% of all national park revenue. Protected Area Advisory Committees (PACs) are established

by Administrative Order. Each PAC is composed of representatives from the PA staff, the local TAO, local communities and leaders, and local NGOs. The role of a PAC is to advise and assist PA staff in conflict resolution, management planning and monitoring, benefit and responsibility sharing, and approval and evaluation of pilot projects proposed by local communities.

- IV. Socio-economic context - over the past 40 years, Thailand has experienced steady economic growth but at the cost of its rich natural resources. While the Government, NGOs and other partners have focused much effort through the existing PA system and other conservation initiatives over the past few decades, the country's PA system is experiencing growing fragmentation and there are concerns that the size of many gazetted national parks and wildlife sanctuaries are insufficient to sustain their flora and fauna. Key threats include, deforestation, large scale agricultural development, urbanization, infrastructure construction and tourism.

2. Problems that the project sought to address

According to the CEO Endorsement Request (CEO ER), the project was in response to the following five threats to Thailand's biodiversity:

- Deforestation (50% lost between 1960 and 2000)
- Agriculture/land use (5 million people estimated to be living inside protected areas)
- Land conversion – development and urbanization
- Tourism (especially tourism developments within protected areas)
- Unsustainable use, including hunting and fishing

The CEO ER proposed the long-term solution for Thailand's protected area system of combining strengthened and systematic protected area management planning, improved institutional and staff capacity, and effective use of new models of protected area management, all supported by knowledge-based planning, improved budget allocations and new and sustainable financing mechanisms. But it also went on to identify five key barriers to the long-term solution.

These were:

- Weak policies, planning and information management;
- Weak institutional and individual capacities for effective PA management and financial planning;
- Park superintendents and staff do not have access to tools, methods or guidelines for developing management plans;
- Deficiencies in capacity and the variety and scale of revenue, finance generating activities and mechanisms for protected areas;
- Limited range and examples of effective models of PA management.

C. Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

The Objective of the CATSPA Project set out in the Project Document (ProDoc) was:

To overcome barriers to effective management and sustained financing of Thailand's protected area system.

The project was designed to overcome barriers that affected the achievement of sustainability in Thailand's PA system, which was to be achieved by examining options and providing the tools for effective management and sustainable financing of the PA's.

The project set out to build capacity and self-reliance within the PA management structure and provide them with the resources to test innovative management and finance schemes at central and field levels. The project further set out to support at central and PA level, the establishment of an effective monitoring system and engage stakeholders in the process. A participatory approach was to be taken with stakeholders to increase the participation by local communities and other stakeholders, and develop methods for the mobilization of diversified revenue sources, supported by improved knowledge-based planning and accounting systems.

At the national level barriers to effective management and budgeting were to be addressed, while demonstrations of strengthened PA management, design of new financing mechanisms and the increased use of improved models of PA management and co-management pursued at the four

demonstration areas.

D. Baseline Indicators Established

Overall the Project Logical Framework as set out in the ProDoc was considered to be weak and not able to meet the monitoring needs for project implementation. The framework does provide indicators for the Objective, but was considered to be ineffective, no indicators were provided for the Outcomes, instead the framework was based around 'Outputs', which are tangible results rather than targets, therefore many of the baselines and targets were not relevant to their respective Outcomes. Some changes were made to the Project Logical Framework during the Inception Period but these were primarily concerning project scope and not Outcome Indicators. Changes to the Project Logical Framework to remedy the lack of Outcome Indicators were made in the MTR but the evaluating team were unable to confirm whether changes were made to the framework post MTR as the latest Project Logical Framework received was to 30 June 2015.

Table 1. Summary of Project Objective, Components, Outcomes and Indicators indicated in the ProDoc and as Revised in Inception Period (underlined) and MTR (*shown in Italic*)

<p>Objective:</p> <p>To overcome barriers to effective management and sustained financing of Thailand's protected area system.</p> <p>Indicators of achievement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Policy guidelines and rules enable successful implementation of effective management plans, designing new revenue mechanisms, and improving co-management efforts, particularly with communities and local government. II. Formal DNP management and financial effectiveness capacity programmes in place. III. Completed objective-driven PA management plans and budgets provide clarity on financial need / gap. IV. Improvements in DNP budget allocations, and increased non-government PA revenues and sources reduce financial gaps. V. Co-management approaches mainstreamed and effective. 		
Outcome	Indicators of Achievement	Activities
<p>Outcome 1</p> <p>Building national capacity for support of biodiversity business</p> <p><i>Improved governance supports enabling environment for long term PA system sustainability.</i></p>	<p>Indicator 1.1</p> <p>5-year integrated national PA system management plan and financial strategy endorsed.</p> <hr/> <p>Indicator 1.2</p> <p>Policies strengthening role of PA Advisory Committees and community participation in PA management is in place.</p>	<p>Activities Outcome 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assess and publish PA strategy ● Policy review, needs assessments, and recommendations ● Systems Development ● Design DNP Management Effectiveness and Evaluation

	<p>Indicator 1.3</p> <p>Effective Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and knowledge-based data management system is in place to assess progress and to inform policy decisions</p>	System
<p>Outcome 2</p> <p>Institutional and individual capacities enhanced</p>	<p>Indicator 2.1</p> <p>New PA management planning framework, planning tools, and methods in place and implemented across the PA system</p> <p><i>Effectiveness Unit in place to support project and institutionalised for long-term role in DNP</i></p> <p>Indicator 2.2</p> <p>New PA business plan framework, integrating management and financial planning, including tools, and methods in place, implemented across the PA system</p> <p><i>Capacity Building Programmes on Effective PA Management and Financial Planning developed for DNP staff as well as partners; and institutionalised within DNP and partners</i></p> <p>Indicator 2.3</p> <p>Capacity building programmes on effective PA management and financial planning developed and institutionalized within DNP and implemented at 5 PA demonstration sites.</p>	<p>Activities Outcome 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review current practices – Initial assessment of PA system (management/budgets) (<i>status quo</i> assessment) Development of the new management plan template and framework Conduct capacity needs assessment Develop guidance and training materials, tools Training across 5 PAs Develop PA management plans and budgets Effectiveness Unit design and creation
<p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Revenue generation mechanisms and management approaches are assessed and tested at 5 PA demonstration sites leading to increased funding levels of the PA system.</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1</p> <p>Capacity built to assess and implement new financing mechanisms, including sustainable tourism plans</p> <p><i>New PA management planning framework, planning tools, and methods in place and implemented across the PA system</i></p>	<p>Activities Outcome 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valuation of PES opportunities (5 PAs) Review and feasibility assessment of specific financing mechanisms (5 PAs) Design and Implementation specific mechanisms (3 PAs) Develop Tourism Plan for

	<p><i>New PA Integrated Management Planning Framework including tools and methods in place and implemented at the pilot units</i></p>	<p>each site for site tourist revenue optimization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop PA site-based partnership and cost effective strategies
<p>Indicator 3.2</p> <p>Appropriate cost offsetting / sharing mechanisms in place and implemented</p> <p><i>Financing Mechanism Identified and Implemented at the pilot unit</i></p>		
<p>Indicator 3.3</p> <p><i>Co-management Approaches enhanced: including strengthened PAC at site-level and mechanism/channels for public engagement in PA management established at site level</i></p>		
<p>Indicator 3.4</p> <p><i>Regional DNP Offices and PA Staff capacities enhanced to coordinate management support and budget allocations across multiple PA in Eastern Complex for improved biodiversity conservation, management effectiveness and cost efficiencies</i></p>		
<p>Outcome 4</p> <p>New models of PA management support effective management of the system.</p>	<p>Indicator 4.1</p> <p>Community, local government and other stakeholder support and collaboration for PA management supported through operationalization of PACs</p> <p><i>Communication Strategy and materials developed for partnership engagement and advocacy</i></p> <p>Indicator 4.2</p> <p>Capacity developed for communities to establish and effectively operate Community PA Funds</p> <p>Lessons-learned captured into management models for</p>	<p>Activities Outcome 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess and strengthen PAC conditions at each site • Develop PA Community fund options and plans (5 PAs) • Develop guidance and training materials for collaborations • Develop optimal management and financial plan recommendations (leveraging from 2.0 above) at regional complex level

	replication and policy decision	
	<p>Indicator 4.3</p> <p>Regional DNP offices and PA staff capacities enhanced to coordinate management support and budget allocations across multiple PAs in WEFCOM for improved cost efficiencies</p>	

E. Pilot Sites

The ProDoc identified five pilot sites for project interventions, these were:

- Doi Inthanon, Chaing Mai Province
- Khao Chamao, Rayong Province
- Koh Tarutao, Satun Province
- Huay Kha Kaeng)Uthai Thani(and Klong Lan Kampaengpetch Province, together forming the 'Western Forest Complex')WEFCOM(complex.

During the Inception Period eight further protected areas were included into the list of pilot sites, making a total of thirteen sites subject to project intervention. The additional sites comprised of adding Mae Wong to the WEFCOM subset and 8 national parks and wildlife sanctuaries comprising of the Eastern Forest Complex)EFCOM(.

F. Main Stakeholders

The main stakeholders below are identified in the ProDoc with their roles. The document states that the project will work closely with these stakeholder organisations and groups.

Government Stakeholders)National(

- Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation – DNP
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment MoNRE
- National Economic and Social Development Board - NESDB
- Department of Marine and Coastal Resources – DMCR
- Department of Fisheries - DOF

Local Governments

- Tambon Administrative Organisation - TAO
- District Administration

Civil Society Stakeholders

- Universities, Research Institutions and Academic Institutions
- Non-Profit Organisations and Associations
- Community Groups

Additionally, hotel and tour operators drawn from the tourism industry are included as main stakeholders as these bodies have taken lead roles in developing the conservation trust funds under Outcome 3.

G. Expected Results

The expected results outlined in the ProDoc and accompanying documents were:

- A five-year, integrated national PA system management plan and financial strategy endorsed.
- Effective monitoring and evaluation and knowledge-based data management system in place

- to assess progress and to inform policy decisions.
- A new PA business plan framework, integrating management and financial planning, including tools and methods developed and implemented across the PA system.
- Capacity building programmes on effective PA management and financial planning developed and institutionalised within the Department of National Park Wildlife and Plant Conservation and implemented at five PA demonstration sites.
- Creation of an Effectiveness Unit within the Department of National Park Wildlife and Plant Conservation to review specific management effectiveness and sustainable financing needs.
- Increased participation by local communities and other stakeholders in the development of novel models of PA management.
- Regional Department of National Park and Wildlife and Plant Conservation offices, and PA staff capacities enhanced, to coordinate management support and budget allocations across multiple PAs in Western Forest Complex for improved cost efficiencies.
- Communication strategy and materials developed and integrated into PA management that effectively supports partnership engagement and advocacy.

III. FINDINGS

A. Project Design / Formulation

1. Analysis of Project Logical Framework

The Project Logical Framework as set out in the ProDoc was weak. It did not include indicators, except for the objective and the indicators given for the outcomes were just the repeat of outputs rather than)SMART(indicators thus many of the baselines and targets are not relevant to the respective outcomes.

During the project inception phase, efforts were made to revise the SRF but it was merely the reorganization of existing outcomes to make them good umbrellas for newly categorized outputs. Outcomes 3 and 4 were combined and a new Outcome 4 was created to accommodate new outputs. As a result the revised SRF still lacked real indicators for all the outcomes and the annual planning was still based on the original SRF, despite changes made during the inception phase. During the 2015 MTR, recommendations were made to review the Project Logical Framework with the full participation of all key stakeholders. The MTR has also made some suggestions for indicators in both the objective and outcomes. These included gender disaggregated indicators.

During the TE the evaluation team requested a copy of the current Project Logical Framework from the both the UNDP and DNP, however, this was not forthcoming, During discussions DNP staff alluded that the Project Logical Framework had not been amended since the MTR , therefore it was not clear to the TE team whether these recommendations were taken on and any actions taken to amend the Project Logical Framework. The 2015 PIR)the latest one provided to the TE by the project(still reported on the original indicators as given in the ProDoc, as did the detailed report on project achievements during the TE by the project team. Despite the lack of officially revised SRF after the MTR, it was observed that some of the changes made under project outcomes are in line with the indicators suggested by the MTR.

2. Assumptions and Risks

The key assumption and project aim identified at the outset of the project was that *“barriers to sustainability of Thailand’s protected area)PA(system could be overcome by looking into effective management and sustainable financing of protected area”*.

The approach to achieving this comprised of a combination of:

- Improved governance support and enabling environment for long term PA system sustainability;
- Institutional and individual capacities enhanced;
- Revenue generation mechanisms and management approaches are assessed and tested at five PA demonstration sites leading to increased funding levels of the PA system; and

ⁱ ProDoc front page first sentence.

- New models of PA management support effective management of the system.

Under such a scenario, the project would deliver significant environmental and development benefits, in terms of improved status of the country's Protected Areas as well as improved livelihoods of local communities living around or in Protected Areas through their active participation in PA management planning, taking into consideration sustainable and harmonious livelihoods and environmental management principles.

The key assumption made for this project is stated in the projects overall aim that is:

“barriers to sustainability of Thailand’s protected area (PA) system” can be overcome “by looking into effective management and sustainable financing of protected areas.”

No specific assumptions are detailed in section 2.3 of the ProDoc, Project Indicators. Assumptions and Risks are included into the Project Logical Framework. These relate primarily to project operational matters and focus mainly on project commitment and support between DNP and partner agencies.

The ProDoc includes a Risk Mitigation Strategy, identifying six identified risks, four of which were considered of low risk status to the project and included climate change risks. Only the international financial crisis was highlighted as a high risk and possibly affecting the establishment of a PES approach. During the Terminal Evaluation there was no indication to suggest that the project was affected either directly or indirectly by this risk in its implementation of the field projects to establish additional funding opportunities i.e. establishment of conservation trust funds.

3. Assessment of Assumptions

The key assumption stated as the project overall aim seems reasonable. To have an impact at the system level, it is sensible to work at both national level on enabling conditions, and at the site level to test approaches with communities. There are, however, some difficulties with the assumption that changes at the system level would be achieved within three years based on proven PA management and financing models which have been tested in pilot sites. Changes require more than enabling policies but also reforms or new issuance of supporting laws, rules, and regulations. Some of these were beyond the authority of DNP and had to be approved at the ministerial and cabinet level. Financing models, for example, need to be accepted and integrated into the national budgeting system through the Budget Bureau. Implementation of Integrated National Park Management also required new mechanisms to move the reforms forward. Establishment of these supporting mechanisms usually takes longer than the project timeframe allows. Changes in policies and institutional systems have to be based on sound justification and informed by proven cases/models from field level. The process to develop, test, and evaluate these models also requires considerable effort and time before they can be used to inform policy changes or be replicated. The original three-year duration was insufficient, especially when the project covers quite a wide spread of pilot sites across regions/geographical areas. In retrospect, the designers needed to consider whether they were working on too many PA management and financing models? It would have perhaps been better to select only models which have high potential to contribute to sustainability of the PA system and pilot them in one or two places with systematic documentation of how it was implemented, what were the results, how could they be replicated nationwide.

4. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design

The project has been designed by incorporating lessons from other projects which were implemented by the Royal Thai Government with different international agencies. Actual implementation of the project has adopted lessons learned and/or built on activities initiated under some of these projects. For example, it has replicated the SMART patrolling system introduced in the WEFKOM under the DANIDA's joint management of PAs)JOMPA(project to other pilot sites, including the EFCOM, resulting in improved patrolling capacity of 14 PAs under the EFCOM. Data from the SMART patrolling was compiled at individual PA level as well as regional office level where the data 'war-room' has been set. PA management planning is more evidence-based using data from the improved patrolling. In Tarutao NP, the marine SMART patrol introduced by the DNP-AFD-WWF Thailand project: Strengthening Andaman Marine Protected Areas Network)SAMPAN(has been further developed to respond to specific situations in the pilot sites and is being rolled out to other marine NPs in other southern provinces under DNP's regular system.

Building on the experience of the GEF-IUCN one-year project to develop a national master plan for PA Management in Thailand with DNP, the project has further completed the Integrated National Park Management Master Plan which will be proposed for Cabinet endorsement as the National Park Reform Master Plan.

The Complex PAC model developed under the JOMPA project has also been applied to the EFCOM with satisfactory results. EFCOM PAC has been established with active participation of private, public, academic and public sectors. EFCOM Management Plan has been developed addressing key issues faced by 8 NPs and Wildlife Sanctuaries within the complex. A mechanism for sustainable financing has been set. The EFCOM PAC has agreed to set up an association to mobilise and run EFCOM Conservation Fund.

5. Planned Stakeholder Participation

The ProDoc identified 14 organizations as key stakeholders and predicted their roles in project implementation. There is a PSC at the national level comprising of representatives from relevant government ministries, private sector who would benefit from the project activities, non-governmental organizations with experiences in PA management and CSOs. The role of the PSC was to supervise and monitor the project delivery according to the annual work plan as well as to ensure co-ordination among the various government agencies and ensure that activities were fully integrated between the other developmental initiatives in the country. At demonstration sites, the emphasis was to focus on active participation of local communities, NGOs, private sector, academic institutes and CSOs in the development and management of sustainable conservation initiatives through the PAC mechanism.

6. Replication Approach

The approach taken to strengthen the overall protected area management effectiveness and financing is appropriate internationally both to countries in this region and beyond. The lessons learned in this project will be available through GEF and UNDP websites, publications and various lesson sharing activities through DNP.

A replication approach is implicitly contained in the project design and strategy. Taking the project achievements forward would involve building on the lessons learned and making use of opportunities for replication and scaling up. Activities to scale up from project experience have been initiated with the extension of the SMART Patrol into other protected areas. Extension of the management plan process is planned for five protected areas annually. The community based participatory buffer zone management has been adopted into DNP's activities for non project protected areas and the EFCOM complex approach is supported by the Budget Bureau for replication into other regional PA complexes in Thailand.

7. UNDP Comparative Advantage

The UNDP's overall comparative advantage for the GEF lies in its global network of country offices, its experience in integrated policy development, human resources development, institutional strengthening, non-governmental and community participation.

The project directly corresponds to the UNDP mission to assist the country in building its capacity in the focal area of environmental protection and management. The project fits into UNDP priorities and programming of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Thailand and United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) priority, "Managing natural resources and the environment towards sustainability". Furthermore, the project complied with the Environment programme under the 2012-2016 UNDP Thailand Country Programme. This set targets for supporting national mechanisms in environmental policy and regulation, community management of natural resources and developing knowledge management around environmental initiatives and policy advocacy.

8. Linkages between the Project and Other Interventions within the Sector

At the design stage, the project was to link with other ongoing interventions in the sectors, these were:

- Management of the Phatam PA Complex (International Tropical Timber Organization)
- Coastal Habitats and Resources Management (European Union)
- Pilot Parks Project (DNP)
- Participatory Management Planning within Kuiburi National Park (World Wildlife Fund)

- Model Forest Approach to Sustainable Forest Management (UN-Forestry and Agriculture Organization- Japan International Cooperation Agency)
- Huay Mae Dee Environmental Education Project (Danced)
- Monitoring of Ecosystem and Biodiversity in Thailand (International Tropical Timber Organization)

The project was also in line with:

- UN Partnership Framework with the Royal Thai Government (UNPAF 2007-2011)
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2007 – 2011

Also directly contributed to GEF Strategic Objective 1: To Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Area Systems and the GEF Strategic Programme 1: Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level.

9. Management Arrangements

According to the ProDoc, the project was to be executed by the Department of National Park, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP) under the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment following UNDP guidelines for nationally executed projects. The Department of National Park, Wildlife and Plant Conservation was to implement the project and work in close cooperation with the Office of the Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning and research institutes, communities, and national and local NGOs.

The project was to establish a Project Board, a Project Management Unit (PMU), which will be located at DNP, in Bangkok.

The Project Board was to be established at Inception with the role of supervising and monitoring the project delivery according to the annual work plan and specifically for:

- Achieving co-ordination among the various government agencies.
- Guiding the programme implementation process to ensure alignment with national and local statutory planning processes and sustainable resource use and conservation policies, plans and conservation strategies.
- Ensuring that activities are fully integrated between the other developmental initiatives in the region.
- Overseeing the work being carried out by the implementation units, monitoring progress and approving reports.
- Overseeing the financial management and production of financial reports.
- Monitoring the effectiveness of project implementation.

The appointed Chair of the Board was to be Director-General of DNP and board members to include representatives from the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning, Royal Forest Department, Department of Marine and Coastal Resources, national Non Government Organisations and Community Based Organisations.

The role of the Project Management Unit was to coordinate between central and field divisions / offices within DNP and relevant organizations under the overall guidance of the Project Board.

PMU was to comprise of an overall Project Director, from within DNP, who was to be the focal point to provide overall guidance to the Project Management Unit members, hired on the project budget. The PMU members were to include a project manager, a project assistant/ financial Officer; project field coordinators and facilitators and a project technical team.

The specific role of the PMU was to:

- Ensure the overall project management and monitoring according to UNDP rules on managing UNDP/GEF projects.
- Facilitate communication and networking among key stakeholders.
- Organize the meetings of the PB.
- Support the local stakeholders.

The role of the Project Manager was to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Project Board. The project manager was also to coordinate directly with UNDP Environment Unit manager who will subsequently report to the Regional Coordination Unit of UNDP-GEF office.

A monthly meeting between UNDP and the project management team was held to monitor the planned activities and their corresponding budgets in the project's Annual Work Plan

It was stated that project management unit would evolve into a 'Effectiveness Team' located within the DNP to ensure the sustainability of the outcomes beyond the life of the project. A proposal was also made suggesting that an ad hoc Advisory Group providing technical guidance and advice on specific issues may be established.

The Project Assurance function was to be performed by UNDP.

The ProDoc calls for the establishment of a Project Steering Committee, a 'Project Board' was established for this purpose.

B. Project Implementation

1. Adaptive Management

Adaptive management has most often occurred as a result of meeting needs as they have arisen during the project implementation process.

At the start of the project, weaknesses and other problems with the Project Log Frame were identified during the Inception Period. These were not defined further or resolved during the subsequent project M&E and implementation. Risk assessment was undertaken as part of the reporting process and interventions identified and applied. The principal issues that arose during project implementation and where an adaptive management was applied were:

- The problems arising from the gap between the departure of the first project manager to the appointment of the second project manager were dealt with satisfactorily.
- Issues relating to financial management and disbursement were recognized early on in the projects implementation. Whilst the complexity of these obstacles were slow to be resolved and the UNDP reported that the efficiency and effectiveness of the ensuing adaptive management were a problemⁱ, an adequate result was achieved overall thereby reducing the identified blockages and assisting in increasing project performance.
- Weaknesses were identified in the on site pilot project implementation and the co-ordination between PMU and pilot sites. To resolve this issue field co-ordinator positions were created.
- In the latter part of the projects implementation and in order to exercise a higher level of ownership of the project, the DNP reshuffled the project management team, engaging a new Project Director who had previously been actively engaged in the project design and inception phases. The designated DNP staff gradually took responsibility for day-to-day management of the project whereas the PM focused more on knowledge management role.
- At project site level, DNP staff adjusted their working programme taking into account the deficiencies in the slow financial project payments, advancing monies from other sources to finance project activities.
- During the latter stages of project implementation and since the MTR, the UNDP, Project Director and key decision makers of DNP held more frequent meetings to address management issues and jointly find workable solutions.

2. Partnership Arrangements

Throughout project implementation, CATSPA has worked with both national and international NGOs at the system and site level. Both the IUCN and WWF are represented on the Project Board. The Wildlife Conservation Society of Thailand sits on the project's technical committee and has provided occasional technical assistance to the project. GIZ collaborated through the Eco-BEST project to help develop financing mechanisms.

At site level, CATSPA worked with Thai Rak Pah Foundation to establish the framework for the planned Doi Inthanon Conservation Fund. The Seub Nakhasathein Foundation assisted with buffer zone management in the sub-western forest complex project and Rak Khao Chamao group in the biological corridor in EFCOM.

At community level all demonstration projects involved the local communities:

- Doi Inthanon, local communities and ethnic groups participated in consultative meetings and activities. Chiang Mai Tourism Business Association, Association of Northern Tourism Federation (Chiang Mai) and Chiang Mai Guide Association are participating in the

ⁱ Reported in the MTR.

establishment of the Doi Inthanon National Park Trust Fund. The registration process is currently ongoing.

- Huey Kha Kheng Wildlife Sanctuary, Klong Lan and Mae Wong National Parks, 68 communities residing along the buffer zone periphery are the main target groups of the buffer zone management project and have participated in project activities.
- Kitchakoot National Park, monks and local people from surrounding communities are participating in the planning activities of the religious festival activities and infrastructure and will, in future, implement the planned sustainable cultural tourism project with income contributed back to the park.
- Tarutao National Park, working in conservation activities with Reef Guardian, an active conglomeration of various stakeholders including tour operators, entrepreneurs, boat taxi drivers, scuba divers, fishermen etc. and academics.
- Protected Areas Committees (PACs), in the eastern forest complex have participated in the EFCOM PAC establishment.
- PAC’s have functioned in CATSPA throughout the project sites.

3. Feedback from M&E Activities used for Adaptive Management

Feedback from M&E activities including risk assessments were reported to the Project Board on a formal basis, through the Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR) and Project Implementation Reviews (PIR). The Project Logical Framework formulated as part of the ProDoc is the projects principal management tool. This set of tools when correctly formulated provides an evolutionary, iterative analytical process that not only provides M&E feedback, but also guides the adaptive management strategy. However, for this project, the Project’s Logical Framework was poorly formulated and not improved during the projects implementation and secondly, the framework’s results level column was updated for the projects PIR, though not on a regular basis. The latest copy the logical framework evaluators received was dated 20 June 2015.

Proactive M&E activities were conducted through various channels, including quarterly meetings of PMU and field teams, visits to demonstration sites by PMU and UNDP and meetings between DNP and UNDP management teams to solve emerging issues, the evaluators understand that these activities increased in the latter part of the project (post MTR) and were considered to be effective by identifying and resolving operational issues, these included:

- Replacement of UNDP-hired Project Manager with Acting PM by a senior DNP officer to increase the level of DNP ownership over the project implementation as well as to resolve the issue of delay caused by the PM’s lack of experience in government financial and procurement procedures;
- Procurement of project equipment through UNDP system to avoid lengthy governmental procedures;
- Arrangement of project workshops by UNDP so participants could be invited directly by UNDP to expedite the process.

4. Project Finance

Project finance comprised of 3.364,545 million USD from GEF grant, and co-financing of 14,200,000 USD from DNP’s contribution.

The total GEF grant amounted to 3.364,545 USD, total disbursed was 3,211,275.70 equal to 95.5% of the total GEF grant available.

The amount disbursed from co-financing was 13,260,359.51 USD equal to 93.38% of the total available co-financing.

Total available funds fro project implementation amounted to 17,564,545 USD, total disbursed was 16,471,635.21 equal to 93.7% of the total funds available.

5. Table 2: Project Co-financing)in US\$(

Co Financing Type / Source	UNDP		DNP		Total	
	Planned \$	Actual \$	Planned \$	Actual \$	Planned \$	Actual \$

Grants	3,364,545	3,211,275.70	-	-	3,364,545	3,211,275.70
In Kind Support	-	49,693.57	14,200,000	13,210,665.94	14,200,000	13,260,359.51
Totals	3,364,545	3,260,969.27	14,200,000	13,210,665.94	17,564,545	16,471,635.21

)All figures in United States Dollar(

Table 3: GEF Financing

GEF Grant \$	
PPG	90,000
GEF Project Grant	3,364,545
Total GEF Grant	3,454,545
Disbursement	3,235,703.01

)All figures in United States Dollar(

6. M&E Design at Entry

The ProDoc states that the ATLAS will be used for keeping track of timely and efficient delivery of the activities and for effective financial monitoring under the Annual Work Programme. This occurred for the duration of the project. As noted above, the principal M&E tool was poorly formulated and not corrected during the projects implementation, furthermore, the ProDoc contains no text analysis to determine 'Assumptions' for the projects. Both of these issues should have been identified and remedied during ProDoc development and review prior to signing of the ProDoc, however, this did not occur. The M&E design at entry is therefore considered unsatisfactory.

Monitoring And Evaluation: Design at Entry Rated Unsatisfactory)U(

7. Implementation of M&E and Reporting

The GEF has a number of requirements for progress reporting and monitoring and evaluation and these were implemented accordingly. In accordance with the ATLAS standard format, Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR) and annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) were prepared.

Quarterly Progress Reports were prepared by the Project Manager and Project Co-coordinator, using information supplied by the project partners. This was submitted by the Project Manager to the Project Board. An annual Project Implementation Review was prepared up to 2015(is prepared by the Project Manager, with inputs and comments from the National Project Director, UNDP Country Office, and Regional Technical Advisor. Project Management ensured that the UNDP-CO received QPRs providing updates on the status of planned activities, the status of the overall project schedule, the achievement of milestones and an outline of the activities and milestones planned for the following quarter.

Quarterly Operational Reports were prepared from the QPRs. These were forwarded to the UNDP-GEF Regional Co-ordination Unit and in turn submitted to UNDP HQ and to the GEF. The major findings and observations of all these reports were provided in annual reports. The Project Implementation Review was also submitted by the Project Team to the UNDP-CO, UNDP Regional Co-ordination Unit and UNDP HQ for review and formal comments, followed by final submission to the GEF. The PIRs reported progress at the outcome level. All key reports were presented to project board members ahead of their programmed meetings and through this mechanism, the key national ministries and national government were kept informed of the Project's implementation progress.

Monitoring And Evaluation: Implementation Moderately Satisfactory)MS(

8. Overall Assessment of M&E Quality

QPR and PIR reports were submitted in a timely fashion for approval. The Project Logical Framework was on the whole considered weak, although it was amended at Inception and MTR. Little use was made of the framework as a continuous monitoring tool assisting either the early identification of arising issues in project implementation or the continuous monitoring of results. Over the project implementation period the Project Board played an active role in providing advice on project strategies and especially on how to integrate project results within the regular government planning and budgeting systems for long term sustainability. During the latter half of the project, visits by UNDP and the project team increased leading to more timely actions to address implementation issues, especially those needing support from central level.

Overall, project M&E has been systematic albeit with more frequency after the MTR. Feedback from M&E activities have been used to inform adaptive management which leads to accelerated accomplishment of planned activities, especially in the last three quarters up to the TE time.

Monitoring And Evaluation: Overall Assessment Moderately Satisfactory)MS(

9. Implementing Agency)UNDP(and Executing Agency Execution

The UNDP is the responsible GEF Agency for the project and carries general backstopping and oversight responsibilities. The UNDP's responsibilities for management, monitoring and evaluation are laid out in the project document. The UNDP's appointed Programme Officer fulfilled the project assurance role and initiated both the Mid Term and Terminal Reviews of the project. The UNDP provided backstopping support to the project along with supporting the Project Board / Steering Committee in carrying out their role and also provided independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This process proceeded satisfactorily.

Financial management issues relating to procurement were identified at an early stage of implementation and steps were taken to remedy the situation. Because a clear understanding of both the UNDP / DNP systems and their interrelationship was not obtained by implementing staff on both sides, a number of financial and procurement issues have persisted. This highlights the need for both parties to have the foresight to agree the rules and procedures prior to project launch and employ or train staff engaged in project implementation to understand the administrative systems of both the implementing and executing agencies.

Implementation Execution: Implementing Agency Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

10. DNP

The Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation)DNP(of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)MoNRE(is the executing agency for the project. To facilitate implementation, a Project Management Unit)PMU(based in the central DNP office in Bangkok was established under the auspices of a Project Director drawn from the senior permanent staff of the DNP. At project site level, implementation was undertaken by the staff of the individual protected areas under the direction of each areas superintendent. Over the course of CATSPA there has been a high turnover of senior staff in DNP. The resulting staff rotation is considered to be a key factor in low levels of ownership of the project at the central office level detected at certain times during the projects lifetime. Ownership at project site level has been much higher and this has been reflected in the levels

of work implemented. However, as noted above, the unresolved financial management issues resulting from inconsistencies between the DNP and UNDP systems led to discord in the area of disbursement and procurement. Staff implementing at the field project level found the system difficult to comprehend and this has directly reduced some outputs and in some cases payment issues for work done.

DNP rules in relation to project workshops and the need to gain approval for each non DNP participant from the office of the permanent secretary created significant problems in arranging workshops and resulted in some workshops being cancelled at short notice and a perceived loss of confidence by stakeholders in DNP was reported as a significant issue by some field offices.

Implementation Execution: Executing Agency Moderately Satisfactory)MS(

11. Overall Quality of Project Implementation and Execution

Overall, project implementation was judged to be highly variable owing to a range of issues, some of which could have been foreseen prior to project start and solutions to smooth implementation found i.e. rules set for disbursement and procurement between both parties. The project experienced inordinate delays both at start up and during implementation leading to two no cost extensions being agreed. The principal reasons for the delays can be attributed to the excessive bureaucratic procedures particularly for the disbursement and procurement processes, staffing changes in both the Project Managers and the Project Directors positions and the bureaucratic procedures for arranging training workshops for non DNP participants.

Implementation Execution: Overall Project Implementation Moderately Satisfactory)MS(

C. Project Results

1. Overall Results

Since the inception phase until the MTR)carried out in March-April 2015(the project was slow in moving towards of its outcomes. According to the MTR report, there were a combination of reasons for this, i.e. inordinate delays before and after start-up, a low level of ownership by DNP, excessive bureaucratic procedures, changes in the project manager's position and a gap between incumbents, changes in the Project Director's position and a management style without mechanism for communication and experience sharing between pilots. Consequently, at the time of the MTR the project had only spent 35 % of the budget. The situation after the MTR, however, had been improved especially with field-level activities)Outcome 3(which accounted for 42 % of the total project budget. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, most of these field projects were on their way to completion or had been completed. Disbursement had improved with 93.7% of the budget spent. Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 have also seen accelerated progress although not all targets and indicators have been met. Key results of Outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4 are listed in Table3.

Table 4: Project results by outcome at the Terminal Evaluation time

Performance Indicator	Baseline	End of project target	Achievement at TE time	TE comments	Rating
1. Policy guidelines and rules enable successful implementation of effective management plans, designing new revenue	Regulations and policies exist but are not clear enough, or enforced properly. Gaps in specific	New policy guidelines, and or new policies in place to facilitate PA management, planning,	Integrated National Park Management Plan)20-year plan(has been completed to serve as the National NP Management Master Plan subject to the	This is likely to be achieved through existing mechanism, i.e. Public Reform Sub-Committee on Environment where DNP is a	MS

mechanisms, and improving co-management efforts particularly with communities and local government	regulations may be hindering PA achievement	budgets, finance and co-management	approval of the Cabinet.	member. But it may not happen by the end of the project.	
2. Formal DNP management and financial effectiveness capacity programmes in place.	Limited formal capacity programs or materials	Specific programmes and materials in place	Programmes to enhance DNP's financial and management capacity developed and tested in pilot areas, some of which were further adopted into DNP regular system)e.g Marine Smart Patrolling, METT and Financial Sustainability	Core programmes)SMART patrol and METT(have been institutionalized and expanded beyond the project demonstration sites by DNP and its partners.	S
3. Completed objective-driven PA management provide clarity on financial need / gap plans and budgets	Less than 50% of Pas have management plans. Currently PA or system financial gap is not clear as not all PAs have management plans and DNP budgeting system is based on rough estimates and historical norms.	100% of project demonstration Pas and a growing number of Pas system wide have management plans and budgets)target is 65% by end project(Three PA level management plan and one Complex (EFCOM) level management plans have been developed and used as a basis for budget allocation from DNP. The model is being rolled out to other places.	Both PA and Complex level plans were developed through participatory process by DNP and communities surrounding the PAs. The model proved to be cost effective and robust compared to conventional methods used by DNP. The process is being introduced to other PAs but the target of 65% will not be achieved by the end of the project.	MS
4.Improvements in DNP budget allocations, and increase non-government PA revenue and sources reduce financial gaps.	Approx. 75% of non-salary PA system financing is government budget and 25% is tourism. No other significant sources exist	Additional revenue sources contribute an additional 10% to 5 project PA demonstration sites and PA system plans in place to target 10% increase across system	PA management plans developed in pilot areas used as a basis for fund raising	Fund raising mechanism (e.g. Conservation Fund) established in EFCOM, Tarutao, and Doi Inthanon. Actual fund raising activities have not yet started but expected to take place soon.	MS

<p>5.Co-management approaches mainstreamed and effective.</p>	<p>Co-management approaches between PA)such as Complex(and with communities and other stakeholders)PAC(are relatively new, poorly understood and underutilized.</p> <p>UNDP financial scorecard=34%</p>	<p>Complex management plan and budget analysis reveals value of Complex approach. PACs are fully functioning and contributing to management in 5 project demonstration PAs.</p> <p>UNDP Financial Scorecard=55 %</p>	<p>EFCOM PACs effectively engaged in developing Complex Management Plan.</p> <p>Lessons learnt and best practice on actual role of PA Advisory Committee)PAC(are developed to inform more effective co-management</p>	<p>EFCOM PAC comprising representatives from all relevant sectors (public, private, academics, community) from 8 PAs who have in-depth understanding of the situation in their respective PAs.</p> <p>Participatory PA management and financial planning of Complex PA as well as individual demonstration PAs is based on solid information.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>1.A 5-year integrated national PA system management plan and financial strategy endorsed</p>	<p>Currently PA or system financial gap is not clear as not all PAs have management plans and DNP budgeting system is based on rough estimates and historical norms.</p>	<p>A financial gap analysis reveals true financial needs or gaps, for the 5 project pilot PAs and the PA system. The System and 5 PAs have financing strategies. Approach is being rolled out to full PA system.</p>	<p>20-year Integrated National Park Management Plan in place and to be endorsed by the Cabinet as National NP Management Master Plan.</p> <p>New PA Management Policy Recommendations made for further consideration/ adoption by DNP</p>	<p>DNP has submitted the Plan through Minister of Environment, waiting for cabinet approval but may be not within the project timeframe.</p> <p>Policy recommendations have been discussed with senior management of the department as well as DNP staff but have not yet been systematically adopted.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>2. Policies strengthening role of PA Advisory Committees and community participation in PA management in place</p>	<p>Limited guidance or training material exists to promote collaboration with local government or PA committee.</p>	<p>Policy is strengthened and guidance materials exist</p>	<p>Policies on PAC reviewed, lessons learnt and best practice on PAC role in PA management developed to provide future guidance nationwide.</p>	<p>This is likely to be completed before the project ends.</p>	<p>S</p>

<p>3. Effective M&E and knowledge-based data management system in place to assess progress and to inform policy decisions</p>	<p>Actual management and cost performance is not tracked. No formal M&E system looking at total effectiveness of performance exists. Adaptive management is not utilized.</p>	<p>DNP has M&E programme)utilizing METT and UNDP Scorecard or similar(and is evaluating PAs, starting with 5 project PAs. Adaptive management measures and processes are in place.</p>	<p>Information from SMART Patrolling regularly updated, compiled and used for better PA management planning in 14 PAs in WEFCOM. This data system is being institutionalised at regional level)DNP Office 2(</p> <p>Updated and better coherent database system developed as part of the government's policy to reclaim PA and forest areas</p>	<p>There is a need to further developed data base system at all regional offices using model developed by Region 2 Office.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Institutional and individual capacity enhanced</p>					
<p>1. Effectiveness Unit in place to support project and institutionalized for long term role in DNP</p>	<p>There is no special Effectiveness Unit within DNP system. Budgetary and management planning are done by Finance and Planning Devisions.</p>	<p>An Effectiveness Unit is in place to support project and is considered for long term role within RFD e.g. being able to generate non-budgetary revenue, complex management approach and PA co-management effectively demonstrated</p>	<p>At the beginning of the project, Innovation Unit was established under National Park Division as a think tank to improve capacities and pick up new innovations across DNP. The Unit was later moved to be under DNP's planning division, with more focus on planning role. After the MTR and as s part of the project's sustainability strategy, the Unit will be re-established as an independent Special Delivery Unit (SDU) reporting directly to the DG with a core function to manage all innovative projects, including those supported by international donors.</p>	<p>Although there has been discussion about the reestablishment of the Unit, it is still at an initial stage and there is not confirmed plan to pursue with the idea.</p>	<p>US</p>

<p>2. Capacity Building Programs on Effective PA Management and Financial Planning Developed for DNP staff as well as partners; and Institutionalised within DNP and partners</p>	<p>No such formal training or capacity building materials or curriculum exists.</p>	<p>Training materials and curriculum developed. Training completed for key management at pilot PA sites.</p>	<p>Training programmes on Financial Sustainability Score Card and Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool)METT(developed and conducted for DNP and partners in demonstration PAs and nearby PAs. The programmes have not yet been institutionalised into DNP regular training system. Training curriculum on SMART Patrolling adopted on a wider scale within DNP. Training curriculum on Marine SMART Patrolling developed for the first time and integrated into DNP's regular training programme for all marine PAs.</p> <p>Other training programmes conducted as part of field demonstration projects included PES, PA Business Planning, Objective-Based PA Management Planning</p>	<p>Although some of the training programmes /curriculum have been adopted by both PA demonstration sites as well as nearby PAs but there is a need to systematically review, make appropriate adjustments and institutionalise them to DNP nationwide system.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Revenue generation mechanisms and management approaches are assessed and tested at five PA demonstration sites leading to increased funding levels of the PA system</p>					
<p>1.New PA Integrated Management and Planning Framework including tools and methods in place and implemented at the pilot units</p>	<p>Basic management plan templates exist. Most plans contain few specific requirements)actions(against clear objectives</p>	<p>Each of the 5 project PA sites and 1 Eastern Forest Complex has complete, functional management plans. Site level activity plans developed and</p>	<p>New PA management and financial modules developed and tested in five demonstration sites including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved PA management plan, based on 	<p>Most of these are still works in progress, some are almost completed and key lessons learnt from the pilots are being documented for upscaling.</p>	<p>MS</p>

		<p>implemented in line with METT baseline result and management plan. A Clear and consistent PA management framework exists for the PA system. METT score increased by 10% at midterm & by 20% at the end.</p>	<p>METT)Inthanon, Mae Wong, Klong Lan(</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of Business Plan)Inthanon, Tarutao(• Conservation Trust Fund)Inthanon, Tarutao and EFCOM(• Forest Complex PAC)EFCOM(• PES potential from tourism and water services)EFCOM(• Buffer-zone management)WEFCOM sub-set(• Joint SMART Patrol, Corridor and Connectivity, Recommendations on Structure to support Ecosystem Complex Management. 	<p>However, it is likely that most of these will not be institutionalised within the project timeframe and will need a roadmap for further steps by DNP after the project ends</p>	
<p>2.Financing mechanisms identified and implemented at the pilot units</p>	<p>No feasibility or valuation approaches or studies in place. Sustainable finance mechanisms largely absent from PA system. Environmentally economic tools are not systematically applied.</p> <p>Conservation Funds have been looked at in a limited</p>	<p>Sustainable finance mechanisms assessed and being pursued within at least 3 PA sites as appropriate. Community, local government and other stakeholders' partnerships leads to better management of well designed and managed funds set-up, sourcing funding from</p>	<p>Conservation funds mechanism has been developed/established in three demonstration PAs including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Doi Inthanon (Funding has been mobilised to set up Doi Inthanon Conservation Foundation with fund raising to support PA management is one of its core activity) -Tarutao (Reef Guardian has extensive active 	<p>Most of these are work in progress but with promising signs to be continued with participation of CSOs and communities after the project ends.</p>	MS

	way.	variety of sources (including PA income). Financial Scorecard score increased to 55% at the end of the project.	membership and clear plan to raise fund to support sustainable PA management) -EFCOM (with comprehensive plan to mobilise funding, partially linking to provincial development plans)		
3. Co-management Approaches Enhanced: including strengthened PAC at site-level and mechanism/ channels for public engagement in PA management established at site level)Outputs 4.1+4.2 in Prodoc(PACs are underutilized and communities and local governments are not engaged in PA management in a consistent or effective manner.	PA system. PACs in particular are utilized more effectively at pilot PA sites. METT score increased by 10% at midterm & by 20% at the end of the project	In all demonstration PAs, PACs have been engaged more actively in the process of: -PA management plan -Establishment of Conservation Fund Mechanism At WEFKOM, 58 communities in buffer zone forest areas have been engaged in the -management of community forests to reduce dependency on PAs. Community Forest Committee have been established and committee networks at sub-district and district levels developed.	The project has achieved end-of project target in terms of strengthening roles of existing PACs and establishing new co-management mechanism (community forest committee networks) More long-term work will need to be continued to strengthen their roles. However, there has not been data available on the improvement of METT score.	MS
4 Regional DNP Offices and PA Staff Capacities Enhanced to Coordinate Management Support and budget allocations across multiple PA in Eastern Complex for improved biodiversity conservation, management effectiveness and cost efficiencies)Output 4.3 in Prodoc(Complex plan and budget strategy allows comparison with PA level approach and optimizes management of individual PAs involved	Promotion of Regional / complex management system leads to better management of PAs in Eastern Forest Complex)measured by METT scores of 8 demonstration PA sites within EFCOM(. METT score increased by 10% at midterm & by 20% at the end of the project	A system to use information from monthly SMART Patrolling was developed in all EFCOM PAs through: -regular update of information in PA management system -monthly meetings between all PAs in EFCOM to share and update information leading to common understanding of situation at	The end of project has been achieved and the model developed by EFCOM is being rolled out to some other sub-complexes. For example, DNP Region 16 in Chiang Mai is getting funding from an external source to replicate the model developed by DNP Region 2 Office.	S

			<p>Complex level and joint planning.</p> <p>A data (war) room has been set up at Region 2 Office to consolidate, digest and use the data for complex level management and to report to DNP.</p>		
Outcome 4 : New models of PA Management captured, communicated and advocated					
1.Communication strategies/platforms designed and implemented for partnership engagement and advocacy	Communication is not well integrated in PA system management	Communication is strategically planned, integrated in PA management and effectively support partnership engagement and advocacy	<p>One key publications namely “Parks for Life” is developed and disseminated to partners and general public.</p> <p>CATSPA’s Facebook and blogs have been developed and used for communication and advocacy purposes</p>	The publication “Park of Life” is comprehensive and provides good information for people who do not know much about the relevance of PAs. <p>More publications could be developed once the pilot activities have been assessed and good models documented. This should be follow up action by DNP after the project has ended.</p>	MS
2.Lessons learnt captured into Management Models for replication and policy advocacy	No systematic management of knowledge, policy decision is mostly not linked to study/research or lesson-learned	Various forms of lesson-learned, technical study is easily accessible, policy decision correlates with available knowledge	<p>Lessons learned on Forest Complex)EFCOM(Management, PAC, and SMART Patrolling are being documented and will be used by DNP for replication/advocacy in the future.</p> <p>A workshop to present lessons learnt with DNP staff nationwide as well as key partners is planned to take place in November 2016.</p>	It is likely that the documentations will be completed before the project ends. A dissemination plan is needed to ensure the publications have reached strategic partners.	MS

Within the remaining five months, further effort needs to be expended to achieve, where feasible, the outstanding works and consolidate the project achievements. Central to this is the need for a joint

'roadmap' workshop session between UNDP and DNP to be convened at the earliest opportunity to plan out activities for the period between Terminal Evaluation and project end and identify any further interventions that can be applied through CATSPA in order to achieve results. Furthermore, the roadmap workshop provides both parties an opportunity to identify the steps to take the projects achievements forward after project end.

Project Results: Overall results Moderately Satisfactory)MS(

2. Relevance

The project is seen as very relevant to Thailand's needs and meets the international obligations and the GEF's strategic objectives.

Firstly, at the international level the project was consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity signed by the RTG in 2003 and The 2050 Nagoya Strategy for Biodiversity)goals B, C and D(. The Project contributes towards the Millennium Development goal 7 "to ensure Environmental Sustainability" and is in line with Outcome 4 of the UNDP Thailand Country Programme)2007 – 2011(: *Improved sustainable utilisation and management of natural resources and environment at the community and national level*. It also contributes to Programme Area 3 of UNDP Country Programme for Thailand (2012-2016) on effective response to climate change.

The project was programmed under the GEF-4 replenishment)2007-10(under the long term objective "To catalyze sustainability of protected area)PA(systems" and within the strategic goals of)i(Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level,)ii(Increasing representation of effectively managed marine PA areas in PA systems,)iii(Strengthening terrestrial PA networks. It also complied with the biodiversity objectives in GEF-5)2010-14(and GEF-6)2014-18('Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems'.

At the national level the project fits with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan)2015 2021(. It also builds on past and ongoing initiatives jointly implemented by DNP and various international agencies.

All pilot projects at demonstration sites have been designed to respond to specific management issues of each participating PA. They were either new innovations)e.g. participatory approach to park management plan(or modifications of existing park management models/tools)e.g. marine SMART Patrol(. These projects were seen as relevant and helping to fill gaps in effective park management.

Project Results: Relevance Relevant (R)

3. Effectiveness

Achieving the Project Objective.

Overall the achievement of the project objectives is advanced, but to achieve these fully, further inputs are required within the last few months of the project in order, as far as possible, to reach their overall goals. Under indicator one referring to new policy guidelines, the Integrated National Park Management Master Plan and National Protected Area System Plan Sourcebook have been prepared but now require Cabinet endorsement. This is expected, but the date is not known. This document when approved, will form the strategic backbone of PA planning and management in Thailand for the next twenty years. Within Indicator two, a SMART Patrol training programme has been developed and successfully tested in the field. The Marine SMART patrol is understood to be the first of its kind worldwide and both the marine and terrestrial SMART Patrol have been replicated in non CATSPA PA's. Reports from the field indicate that the SMART Patrols have been successful, not only in reducing impacts on the PA's, such as reduction in illegal poaching activities but also providing detailed information on a wide range of ecological and land issues that are used in day to day management as well as forward planning.

A wide range of training activities covering management and financial effectiveness have been implemented and these need to be systematically integrated into the DNP system. Within indicator three, all of the demonstration protected areas applied a participatory and evidence based planning approach to develop management plans. Each plan includes a financial gap analysis and ideas for

business plan development. The indicator target of 65% of Thailand's PA's to have a management plan and budget has not been achieved. This was considered to be an ambitious target and probably not achievable in the project timeframe. Within Indicator four, three demonstration PAs (i.e. EFCOM, Tarutao and Doi Inthanon) have established conservation trust funds. These require registering before they can operate. Overall, there has not yet been any increase in revenue to the demonstration PA's. Further opportunities for fund raising have been identified, including launching a special car licence plate in partnership with the Department of Land and Transport to support Thai PA's. Within Indicator five, the EFCOM Complex Management Plan was completed with participation of EFCOM PAC. This plan is now used as a basis for resource mobilisation to support complex level conservation endeavours. Drawing on experience from the PAC's nationally, a manual and guideline is under development and when complete will be used by DNP to guide its future engagement with the PA PACS.

Component 1:

The focus of this component was to improve the governance enabling environment in order to achieve long term PA sustainability. Mixed results have been achieved from project interventions within this component. Under Indicator 1.1, the Integrated National Park Management Master Plan has been completed but has yet to be submitted to Cabinet for their endorsement. DNP have indicated that this will be achieved in the near future. In the meantime, according to DNP management, the plan is being used as the strategic planning document for determining department interventions in the PA system. No financial strategy for the whole PA system was formulated, a financial gap analysis was undertaken for a number of the pilot PA's, but not system wide. Financial strategies were prepared for EFCOM, Inthanon and Tarutao protected areas, but to date these have not been operationalized and tested, thus the approach taken has not been rolled out to the wider PA system. Activities under Indicator 1.2 focussed on the Protected Area Committees (PAC). This included the initiation of a Complex level PAC at the EFCOM pilot site. This initiative received positive feedback from the stakeholders during the evaluation process. At the present time, DNP have engaged a consultant to review lessons learned from the PAC process and these will be reinforced through a series of workshops to be facilitated by the project. Activities under Indicator 1.3 concerning the improvement of monitoring and evaluation across the PA system, training for METT was undertaken both for project and non project PA staff and METT was applied to the pilot project sites. No systematic and functioning monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system for the PA system as a whole was established. The data received through the SMART Patrol is compiled at the individual PA and regional level and this feeds into the management of the individual PA's leading to adaptive management. The data, however, is not currently analysed at central level to feed into system level management.

Component 2:

This component focused on enhancing institutional and individual capacities. A central action was to establish an 'Effectiveness Unit' to support both project implementation and in the long term, play a role in guiding aspects of PA management such as generating non-budgetary revenue and effective PA co-management. The unit was established and subsequently dissolved in DNP internal restructuring. DNP have given assurances that the unit will be re-established as an 'Excellence Centre' taking care of the PES Fund, resource mobilisation and conservation fund, under the National State Enterprise Reform Plan. Training on management tools such as METT, financial score card, as well as skills specific to PA management functions such as SMART Patrol, sustainable park management etc. were conducted at site level. Additionally training materials and curriculum on METT, sustainable financing, business plans, communication for conservation, and SMART patrolling have been developed and training completed for staff in all pilot PA's. Marine Patrolling Training Curriculum has been institutionalised into the Pracharat (Public-Private Partnership) Training Institute.

Component 3:

Management Plans for Doi Inthanon NP, Tarutao NP (combined with the Andaman Sea Management Plan), Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary (combined with Thung Yai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary World Heritage Management Plan), Klong Lan NP, Mae Wong NP and EFCOM have been completed and adopted into the DNP management system. DNP have indicated that due to past financial constraints it was able to develop only five PA management plans annually as the process was outsourced to external consultants/universities. With the new PA management planning model based on METT findings, any PA could develop its own management plan through participatory process within minimum budget. Hence, the model can be rolled out widely across all PAs.

The Management Effectiveness Tracking tool (METT) was completed in October 2014 for the projects pilot sites. This was updated in June 2016. According to indicator 3.1 the METT score increase was to be 10% by mid term review and 20% by the end of the project. The recorded METT scores fall significantly short of these targets with the 2016 scores registering a total percentage change of between 0 and 10% overall.

Indicator 3.2 set a target for sustainable financing mechanisms to be pursued in at least three PA's. Conservation trust mechanisms have been initiated in Doi Lthanon, Tarutao and EFCOM. At terminal evaluation, none of the trusts had been registered and were not operational. During the TE, discussions were held with the various trust stakeholders who were keen to formally launch the trusts. The delays were attributed to agreeing the final trust board structure with DNP.

Whilst the Protected Area Committee (PAC) system was already established prior to the project, the project interventions have provided good working examples of working relationship building between the DNP and community stakeholders, with the 'lessons learned' being adopted into the DNP management decision making process. Within this component, the complex PAC EFCOM model was developed. Complex Management Plan and special monitoring and reporting tools were introduced with the participation of EFCOM PAC and are now used as a basis for resource mobilisation to support complex level conservation efforts. The Complex approach is supported by the Budget Bureau for replication into other regional PA complexes in Thailand.

Component 4:

Communication activities were well advanced within Indicator 4.1, with DNP using both published materials and social media to promote Thailand's protected areas. DNP supported by consultants published 'Parks for Life: Why We Love Thailand's National Parks'. To support Indicator 4.1, 'Lessons learned captured into management models for replication and policy decision.' A consultant has been engaged to draw lessons learned from project experience in the key areas, EFCOM, PAC and SMART Patrol.

Project Results: Effectiveness Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

4. Efficiency

Efficiency refers to the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost-effectiveness or efficacy. In other words, it is a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. In light of this definition, the overall project efficiency is rated as 'Moderately Satisfactory'.

Time-wise, project implementation has been delayed and was much behind schedule especially from the inception phase until the MTR. By mid-term review, only 35% of the project budget had been delivered. Projects under Outcome 3, which accounted for 42% of the total project budget were held back for 8 months due to bureaucratic constraints within DNP financial procedures.

Cost wise, a large percentage of expenditure for Outcomes 1 and 2 was for consultancy fees. For Outcome 1, the consultant has satisfactorily completed a report on the New PA Management Policy Recommendations which have been discussed with DNP policy makers as well as staff at both national and local levels. The recommendations will be further considered by DNP for future adoption. The consultant also produced two publications: Park for Life: Why We Love Thailand's National Parks together with the DNP Project Director. The publications have been disseminated to DNP strategic partners as well as general public for advocacy purposes. Overall, the work of the consultant under this Outcome is economically efficient.

For Outcome 2, the consultant has also developed a number of capacity building programmes/curriculum and conducted actual training for DNP staff at national and demonstration PA levels. However, most of these programmes have not been institutionalized within DNP despite relatively high costs of consultancy services.

At the time of the TE, most of the field projects under Outcome 3 have been completed or almost completed, hence project expenditure has increased to 70%. Compared to the results, the budget for Outcome 3 has been well spent. However, many of these projects still need to be evaluated and documented for replication at PA system level.

There was also high turnover rate of project staff from DNP. During the initial months of the project, a working group was set up as part of the Innovation Unit. Members of the group came from every Division within DNP, including some of the PA superintendents outside Bangkok. This structure

proved to be inefficient as staff allocated to this function were not full-time with the project. After the Innovation Unit was dissolved, a few staff from the Planning Division were assigned for part-time project M&E responsibilities. There were also changes in the positions of Project Director (DNP) and Project Manager (UNDP-hired) causing discontinuity of project activities and inconsistency of project directions.

The lack of a jointly developed 'rule book' for project implementation also resulted in a remarkable delay in project progress as Project Manager and DNP project implementing staff did not have a clear understanding of both UNDP and DNP procedures, and in particular of financial disbursement and procurement regulations.

Project Results: Efficiency Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

5. Country Ownership

Country ownership is confirmed through the continuous participation of government and agencies, including the Project Board, Executing Agency (DNP), and National Budget Bureau Office, Office of National Economic and Social Development Board and other stakeholders. The national commitment to extending the results of protected area management are confirmed by the establishment of a new budget category for 'Forest Complex Management' in addition to individual PA budget allocation within the national budget framework.

6. Project Board (PB)

The Project Board has a broad-based membership from core ministries/agencies, relevant private sectors, academic institutes, CSOs and communities. The ProDoc suggested quarterly meetings for the Project Board. It was expected that frequent meetings would lead to collaboration on innovations in PA financing and management, especially by national planning and budgeting authorities and the private sector which benefits from the PA's natural resources. In the initial years, the PB had only four meetings annually and this proved to be insufficient, for example when the project faced difficulty and delay. This number of meetings proved to be insufficient.

In the second half of the project, the PB held more than four meetings a year with active participation of core members who had a vital role in ensuring that project results would be sustained through regular government planning and budgeting systems after the project ended. For example, the National Budget Bureau Office has set up a budget category for 'Forest Complex Management' in addition to individual PA budget allocation. The Office of National Economic and Social Development has also included some of the lessons learnt from the project (e.g. SMART Patrolling, Conservation Fund) into the next National Development Plan, effective from October 2016. Frequent meetings and exchanges of views among the PSC members has also helped to establish aligned strategies and collaboration in the field of environmental and PA management which assists in long-term benefit for the country.

7. DNP

In the first year, DNP has established the 'Innovation Unit' and assigned staff from all concerned divisions as a working group under this unit. Despite this clearly established structure, the level of DNP staff participation in project activities was relatively low, leading to the dissolution of the Innovation Unit in the following year. The project's M&E function was moved to staff under the Planning Division who made periodic visits to the field site but were not fully engaged in the project. Thus, there was a missing link between project initiatives and DNP's core system.

During the course of the project, there were frequent changes in the Project Director's position. The first Project Director who was actively engaged since the project design and starting phase was relocated to another position after one year. The replacement was assigned part-time to the project, in addition to his other management duties/priorities. Although he was committed, key management issues particularly on the bureaucratic budget disbursement procedures were not sufficiently and effectively addressed, resulting in long delay in project implementation especially at demonstration sites. In late 2015, there was another change in the Project Director's position. The first Project

Director was reassigned to the project. The level of DNP's ownership in the project has significantly increased, evidenced by timely solution to financial disbursement issue, close support and monitoring of project activities, and gradual increase of DNP's role in day-to-day project management where a senior DNP official was assigned to take over some of the management functions from the UNDP-hired PM as part of the exit strategy. Selected models of innovative PA management developed by demonstration projects have also been adopted into DNP regular programmes.

8. Other Stakeholders

Level of stakeholder participation at demonstration PAs is evidently high, showing their commitment and sense of ownership over the project. In Tarutao, a local CSO-Reef Guardian comprising of broad-based stakeholders benefiting from the coral reef related business actively contributed to reef conservation activities and the establishment of the Conservation Trust Fund. The same was seen in Doi Inthanon where local stakeholders from highland communities, NGOs, private business sector, academia, and local governments formed themselves to set up "Inthanon Conservation Trust Fund". THB 500,000 was mobilised for registration of the Fund. EFCOM PAC is also moving towards the same direction in compliance with the jointly developed EFCOM PA Management Plan.

D. Mainstreaming

Whilst not a central component of the project with the ProDoc only highlighting the need to mainstream co management approaches as an indicator of the overall project objective, mainstreaming occurred at various levels as output of project implementation, whilst it could be considered successful in the UNDP priority areas of poverty alleviation and improving governance, and supported natural disaster risk management and climate change, it was altogether weak in promoting gender mainstreaming due to the lack of mainstreaming focus in the ProDoc. The overall mainstreaming activities comprised of:

- Gender mainstreaming – The ProDoc did not have an explicit gender perspective and there appeared to be no effort to address gender issues during the projects implementation. However, there were no clear gender discrimination measures especially among local stakeholders participating and benefiting from project activities.
- Poverty Alleviation – Activities in sub-set WEFKOM focused directly on improving livelihoods of 58 communities living around the buffer zones of three PAs and conservation forest areas. To reduce the community's dependence on income from non-timber forest products, sustainable livelihood activities were introduced including eco-tourism and home-stay. As these activities were introduced at a rather late stage of the project, their impact on poverty reduction could not yet be seen at the time of the TE. There are also other activities which could potentially have indirect impact on poverty reduction, for example)1(coral reef conservation which increases its fish breeding capacity benefiting through increasing fish stocks for local fishermen;)2(creation of elephant corridors which reduces risk to farm crops; and)3(training villagers living around trekking trails in Doi Inthanon PA as local guides.
- Improving Governance – The objective of mainstreaming is only mentioned in the ProDoc in relation to indicator five of the Project Objective "Co-management approaches mainstreamed and effective". The close working between DNP and the community stakeholders in the demonstration sites is creating benefits for local governance and is increasing understanding and creating mutual beneficial outcomes for both community development, protected area management and the environment as a whole.
- Natural Disaster Risk Management – The project has contributed to mainstreaming disaster risk management through its activities to improve management of its natural forests, thereby contributing to maintaining and improving both forest health and forest cover. This in turn has multiple ongoing long term benefits such as improving water regulation, soil conservation and landslip reduction in the upland areas. Conservation activities at Tarutao National Park have contributed to improving the health of the coral reef increasing its protective attributes against tidal surges and storms.
- Climate Change – The project supports building climate change resilience through improving the protection and management of landscapes, seascapes and terrestrial and marine habitats, by improving ecosystem health, its resilience to climate change increases. Furthermore, actions to conserve the forest environment contribute to increasing the carbon sink capacity of Thailand's forests and supports the countries obligations within UNFCCC.

E. Sustainability

1. Financial Resources

Improving financial sustainability of the protected area system was a central pillar in this project. Although at the time of the Terminal Evaluation, this has not yet been fully achieved but core systems have been established and mechanisms/plans have been made to reduce risks on financial resources after the project has ended.

Three conservation trust mechanisms have been established in the project area but have not yet been launched. These trusts are planned to be operationalised as soon as possible within the project timeframe. Their success will be determined by their ability to be replicated to other areas.

During the Terminal Evaluation, representatives from the Budget Bureau and NESBD stated that there was general government support for the protected area system and that endeavours would be made to provide financial backing. The PAC Complex approach was singled out by the Budget Bureau as an example of an area based approach that had relevance and could be supported.

Funding sources such as Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) have been identified nationally as potential long term funding stream to support environmental actions including PA management. A PES concept has been included in the EFCOM PA Management Plan. The idea is to generate income from water services the EFCOM PAs supply to the industrial sector in this region. PES linked to improved tourism management in one of the religious destinations is also piloted in a Khao Kitchakoot National Park under the EFCOM.

Other fund raising activities such as special car number plates have also been discussed for further adoption by DNP.

Sustainability: Financial Resources Likely (L)

2. Socio-Political

There are low socio-political risks associated with the sustainability of the project outcomes. On the reverse side, climate change and its impact on socio-economic activities has raised the level of public awareness of the need for effective PA and forest conservation and management.

DNP has supported more socio-economic development projects to local communities resulting in their improved livelihood opportunities. A more people-based approach as opposed to strict law enforcement has established mutual trust between DNP officials and local communities living in the PAs or buffer zones. In the nine WEBCOM communities, the project has established a strong foundation for intra-village collaboration on jointly developed rules and regulations for conservation. This model will be replicated by the Royal Forestry Department to cover the remaining communities in this buffer-zone area, using the budget allocated by the governor of Uthaitanee under the Provincial Development Plan.

Some local governments (Tambon Administrative Organizations) have also been engaged as part of these conservation committees and have adopted the activities into their development plan.

Sustainability: Socio-political Likely (L)

3. Institutional Framework and Governance

The issue of sustainable PA and forest management is at the top of the national development priority list. The Cabinet has issued two resolutions to reclaim the forest areas, especially through Public-Private-People collaborations. PPP projects have been initiated at national and local levels to support the realisation of these resolutions, including in the project areas.

The 20-Year Integrated National Park Management Plan is being submitted for Cabinet endorsement as the National Master Plan for PA Management. This endorsement will secure long-term commitment not only at the departmental but also ministerial and inter-ministerial levels to better PA management. It will guide the process for effective PA management reform, which is part of the ongoing national reform agenda. The current Project Director is a member of the reform working group on sustainable environment management.

Under the current government's roadmap, there will be a general election in the middle of 2017 but the change in government will not affect the reform agenda, which is part of the Constitution.

Sustainability: Institutional Framework and Governance Likely (L)

4. Environmental

Achieving environmental sustainability underpins this project. Actions and capacity building taken both at central and field level support improvements that ultimately encourage achieving this aim. The formulation and adoption of both system wide plans and individual PA plans supports long term sustainability. Individual field projects concerning the conservation and reintroduction of the slipper orchid and creation of elephant corridors contribute directly to species conservation. The marine buoy marking project located around the coral reefs at Tarutao protect a fragile ecosystem, improved management in the community forests and buffer zones located around the PA's reduces pressure on forest habitats, SMART Patrol reduces the impact of poaching and intrusion into the PA's and education activities undertaken by DNP and Reef Guardian particularly with young people will hopefully influence environmental attitudes into the future.

Forest fire was among one of the environmental sustainability threats in some project areas, such as Doi Inthanon. The joint SMART Patrol training and exercise whereby local villagers are engaged in the patrolling exercise with DNP rangers prove to be effective for both fire prevention and management.

Sustainability: Overall Likelihood Likely (L)

F. Impact

Thailand's biodiversity is globally significant. IUCN's Red List notes that Thailand has over 1700 globally threatened species, including several critically endangered species of mammals, birds, reptiles, fish, and plants. Nine per cent of all species known to science can be found in the country and significant portions of several WWF Ecoregions 200 also fall inside Thailand. Thailand's topography contributes to high gamma diversity, particularly of coastal and marine ecosystems along the thin long mountainous peninsula of Southern Thailand. In order to conserve its globally and nationally important biodiversity, Thailand started to establish protected areas (PAs) in the 1960s. Currently, the country's protected area system consists of more than 400 PAs, including national parks, wildlife sanctuaries, forest parks, non-hunting areas, botanical gardens, and arboreta, covering approximately 18% of the country's total land area and 8% of its territorial seas.

Environmentally, the overall environmental impacts will not become apparent until the medium / long term, however, the project is anticipated to create positive changes in global environmental benefit through improved PA management. These changes will be seen long term subject to the following conditions/factors

- i. The 20-year Integrated National Park Management Plan is adopted as Thailand's Master Plan for National Park Management.
- ii. Necessary mechanisms for the implementation of the Plan (e.g. budget, human resources, management systems, etc.) are established to support implementation.
- iii. Actual implementation according to the Plan

Socio-economically, it is also anticipated that the project will contribute to improved livelihoods of local stakeholders from the sustainable PA management schemes initiated through this project. It has also increased level of public awareness on sustainable environmental management.

Although this project has experienced implementation difficulties as a result of frequent staff turnover, the lack of ownership by the DNP senior staff during the middle part of the implementing period and difficulties with the financial and procurement regulations, there have been a number of important impacts that can be attributed to the project.

- i. Increasing stakeholder involvement and 'ownership' within the communities surrounding the protected areas through the PAC can bring positive results through improvement of management activities within the buffer zones and protection of the core zones. The successful outcomes in activities such as)i(agreement of routes for elephant corridors,)ii(establishment of SMART Patrol,)iii(introducing sustainable management in community forests,)iv(improving ecotourism management and facilities, can be attributed to the participatory planning activities undertaken within the framework of the project. DNP recognize the importance of working with the community stakeholders and this approach is being adopted into the DNP's working philosophy. Furthermore, the lessons learned from these activities are being replicated in other protected areas in Thailand.
- ii. Utilizing participatory and evidence-based approaches to develop and implement PA management plans has provided good replication potential in the wider Thailand PA system and this approach shows evidence of strong stakeholder support where it has been applied.
- iii. Although SMART Patrol had been previously established in Thailand on a limited scale, the project allowed DNP to further develop and trial the activity on a larger scale and in both terrestrial and marine protected areas. With the experience gained in the project, DNP have concluded that SMART Patrol does provide an advantageous approach to managing protected areas both through its organized and logical approach to patrolling and policing an area and also in providing a systematic methodology for data collection that can be used to guide and improve future management decisions. SMART Patrol is being rolled out to other PA's as finances allow.
- iv. The Complex PAC model was successfully developed. The EFCOM Complex Management Plan was completed with participation of EFCOM PAC and is now used as a basis for resource mobilisation to support complex level conservation efforts. The Complex PAC model is supported by the Budget Bureau and will be rolled out to other PA's in due course.
- v. Three demonstration PA's established conservation trust funds. Whilst these have still to be operationalized, because of the enthusiasm shown by the various stakeholders involved, their potential for success is deemed to be positive and could provide new models for replication in the future.

IV. KEY LESSONS LEARNED

The key lessons learned in this project are:

- i. During the projects outline, attention should be paid to design of the 'Outcomes' as described in the ProDoc, the 'Outcomes' should be defined more precisely in order that the ideas generated during the project design stage can be transformed into viable activities in line with the original design concept. By defining indicative activities under each Outcome in the ProDoc any misinterpretation of the original project ideas can be avoided, this is especially relevant where the implementing team is not experienced in implementing GEF-financed projects.
- ii. Where there is a high level of staff turnover, especially of senior managerial staff within an implementing agency / department, this can lead to periods of low project ownership resulting in reduced project workflow and outputs. The establishment of a dedicated project management team may provide a more stable and subsequently beneficial approach. DNP's proposal to establish a 'Special Delivery Unit' would support this approach.
- iii. During the project preparation period and prior to project launch, UNDP and implementing agency need to agree a harmonised system for the disbursement of project monies. This should be formally set out in a 'Project Implementation Rule Book' agreed between all appropriate participating agencies. Prior to project start, those persons responsible for project

- financial management should receive training in the agreed procedures thus eliminating, as much as possible, the financial and disbursement issues raised in this project.
- iv. In cases where, according to internal rules, the implementing government agency requires the approval from its Permanent Secretary or other high official for non government participants to attend a workshop or other project activity, a prior in principle 'block' approval' or system for 'fast track' approval should be agreed either before project launch or as part of the annual work plan approval.
 - v. Effective protected area management relies on the inter collaboration between the protected area managers and agencies, other related government agencies and involved stakeholders such as non-government organizations, private sector, academic institutions and local communities. To maximize the effectiveness of collaboration clearly defined roles and benchmarking should be agreed between the parties along with agreed communication channels.
 - vi. Pilot activities at the projects demonstration sites are considered to be highly relevant project components, not only for trialing new ideas and approaches to protected area management but also for filling existing management gaps within the existing system, this approach was appreciated both by DNP and local stakeholders.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusion

The difficulties faced by this project were few in number, but were together significant to the day to day administration of the project leading to time delays and periods of inactivity. The most serious of these was the periods of time where the DNP senior staff did not take ownership. This was counteracted by DNP staff who were enthusiastic in seeing the project completed. Where the senior management of the implementing agency fails in their responsibilities to manage the project awarded to them, it places UNDP in a difficult position both with the implementing agency and GEF and with few opportunities to redress the problem. Issues concerning financial management and procurement although limiting were largely overcome by adaptive management by both DNP and UNDP in the latter part of the project. This has resulted in most of the work being implemented.

The development of the national PA plan was a major effort and provides a future basis to guide future PA management and ensure sustainability. Although the target of 65% of system wide PA's having a management plan was not achieved, the experience of developing individual protected area management plans for a number of protected areas has created the capacity in DNP to roll out the management plan formulation process. Commitment has been given by DNP to continue this work.

Working with communities proved to be successful and has provided DNP with both experience and successful cases on which it can build. The commitment of the Budget Bureau to continue funding the development of the Complex PAC model can be seen as testament to this success and DNP have indicated their commitment to the stakeholder participation process in PA management.

Continuation of the field activities such as SMART Patrol and Marine SMART Patrol, creation of elephant corridors, maintenance of reef protection buoys are expected to continue and be replicated in other areas.

A number of activities remain incomplete and effort is required for these to be concluded by the projects end. These include the launching of the three conservation trusts established in the framework of the project and the adoption of the national PA plan. A 'Road Map Workshop' has been proposed in this Terminal Evaluation with the aim of consolidating the projects successes and planning the next steps.

B. Recommendations

- I. A 'Road Map Workshop' should be convened before the end of the project with the aim of consolidating the projects achievements and planning the next steps in order to sustain the projects accomplishments and roll out further actions based on lessons learned, thereby serving as a project 'exit strategy'. The workshop delegates should include key DNP staff and stakeholders from each project outcome / individual field project, representatives from the project steering committee and the UNDP. The main areas for discussion should include:
 - a. National Park Conservation Funds;
 - b. PAC (Complex and Individual PA level);
 - c. SMART Patrol/Marine SMART Patrol;
 - d. Protected Area Management Plan Development / Spatial Planning for Park Management;
 - e. Protected Area Business Plan Development;
 - f. Monitoring and Evaluation Tracking Tools and their future implementation;
 - g. Preparing and disseminating 'Knowledge Products' based on lessons learned.
- II. Based on the outcome of the 'Road Map Workshop' sufficient budget and technical support to implement the 'Road Map' should be sought from government resources, private sector investors and appropriate donors.
- III. With the support of the Budget Bureau, Area-Based / Complex PA Management should be extended to other locations in Thailand. The 'Road Map Workshop' can provide the initial discussion forum and set the agenda and timetable for this action.
- IV. Prior to any future UNDP / GEF project launch with DNP, a 'Project Implementation Rule Book' covering financial disbursement and procurement procedures should be drawn up and agreed between the parties concerned. This rule book should then serve as the manual for all staff to observe during the implementation of the project.
- V. DNP should establish a Special Delivery Unit for project implementation to ensure efficient and effective management of the project and sustainability of its results. This unit should also have the remit to develop new projects and seek funding opportunities.
- VI. Project manager appointed should have knowledge of both DNP and UNDP financial and procurement systems in order to identify and rectify issues and blockages that occur outside of the 'rule book' both speedily and without disruption to the ongoing project operation.
- VII. Prior to project launch, agreement should be sought from the Permanent Secretary or other high official as to the procedure for non government participants to attend a workshop or other project activity in order to reduce time delays in seeking approvals.
- VIII. The project management team for the project "Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex" should review the results of this project and integrate the lessons learned into their activities.
- IX. During the course of the projects implementations the DNP and local communities have participated in a number of conservation supporting activities at a level not previously undertaken, the lessons learned from this experience should be collated and analysed by DNP and those deemed to be successful integrated into the departments working practices.

C. Actions to Follow Up or Reinforce Initial Benefits From the Project

1. Actions by the project

Prior to the end of December 2016, the project should:

- I. Complete any outstanding works started in the field projects and ensure that all accounts are settled with third party contractors.
- II. Where planned small project works have been identified that can be completed prior to the end of the project, these should be initiated at the earliest opportunity.
- III. Plan and initiate the 'Road Map Workshop' and follow up actions arising in accordance with the decisions made at the workshop.
- IV. Review the consultants work currently engaged to draw lessons learned from project experience in the key areas, EFCOM, PAC and SMART Patrol and identify any gaps in their

work. Ensure that the lessons learnt / knowledge generated from the project implementation is consolidated into knowledge products and resource books and disseminated widely.

2. Actions by DNP

In order to ensure continuation of activities initiated in the project and their replication into other protected areas in Thailand, e.g. terrestrial and marine SMART Patrol, Complex PACs, working with buffer zone communities to assist with community forest management and reduction of conflicts through the elephant corridor creation of buffer zones etc. DNP should, with the Budget Bureau, National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB) and MoNRE ensure that the programmes and strategies governing these activities are adopted into government policy and that continuous funding is identified.

D. Proposals for Future Directions Underlining Main Objectives, Best and Poor Practice in Addressing Issues Relating to Relevance, Performance and Success

1. Best Practice

Community participation and involvement in the project through the PAC, Complex PAC and other project initiatives has been successful and contributed to the success of a number of project components due in part to the building of trust and improved working relations between DNP and the community. The lessons learned working with communities needs to be adopted into DNP's overall operational philosophy and the practices continued and replicated into other areas. For the future identifying opportunities for community participation should feature as a central core of protected area planning and management projects in Thailand.

2. Poor Practices

One of the single most limiting factors that created issues for project implementation and resulted in a lack of ownership for the larger part of the project implementation period, is the practice of frequent staff turnover within the DNP structure. This could ideally be overcome by DNP's proposal for the creation of a Special Delivery Unit for project implementation. To be beneficial, the unit would need to be staffed with permanent members whose skills could be developed to meet specific project management needs.

ANNEX ONE: TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT)

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 the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full size project titled, Catalyzing the Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System (CATSPA) (PIMS #3825).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Catalyzing the Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System (CATSPA)			
GEF Project ID:	3517		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	3825	GEF financing:	3,364,545	
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia and Pacific	Government:	14,200,000	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-1 Catalyzing Sustainability of PAs	Total co-financing:	14,200,000	
Executing Agency:	Department of National Park, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)	Total Project Cost:	17,564,545	
Other Partners involved:	German International Cooperation (GIZ)/ECO-BEST ECO-BEST- Enhancing the Economics of Biodiversity and Ecosystems Service in Thailand/South-East Asia	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		27-09-2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31-08-2013	Actual: 31-12-2016

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project aims to overcome barriers to sustainability of Thailand's protected area (PA) system, by looking into effective management and sustainable financing of protected areas.

The project will also build the confidence and capacities of the PA management authorities and provide them with resources to test innovative PA management and financing schemes. In addition, it will support development of appropriate incentives, establishment of an effective monitoring system, and community participation in conservation efforts.

Systemic barriers will be addressed at the national level, while demonstrations of strengthened PA management on the ground through sustainable financing will be done at demonstration sites. These

demonstrations will include, for example, developing novel models of PA management, increased participation by local communities and other stakeholders, and mobilization of diversified revenue sources, supported by improved knowledge-based planning and accounting systems.

Financial management capacity weaknesses and systemic barriers to effective management and budgeting will be addressed at the national level, while demonstrations of strengthened PA management, design of new financing mechanisms, and the increased use of improved models of PA management and co-management will be pursued at the four pilot sites.

The project objective is to overcome barriers to effective management and sustained financing of Thailand's protected area system. The key outcomes of this project are:

1. Improved governance supports enabling environment for long term PA system
2. Institutional and Institutional and individual capacities enhanced.
3. Revenue generation mechanisms and management approaches are assessed and tested at 5 PA demonstration sites leading to increased funding levels of the PA system.
4. New models of PA management support effective management of the System.

The project is executed by the DNP under the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment following UNDP guidelines for nationally executed projects (NEX). The Department of National Park, Wildlife and Plant Conservation implement the project and work in close cooperation with research institutes, communities, and national and local NGOs. The project has established a Project Board, a Project Management Unit (PMU), which is located at DNP, in Bangkok.

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 project 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 method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. 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, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see [Annex C](#)) 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.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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 at least three of the five project demonstration sites, and at least one of the two “proxy” sites including the following project sites: Klong Lan National Park and Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary in the Western Forest Complex. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: MONRE, DNP, UNDP, ONEP, National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB), Department of Coastal and Marine Resources, Provincial government, Local government, local communities, Royal Forest Department, NGOs, Provincial Conservation Forum (PCF), Trade & tourism associations, Protected Area Committees.

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 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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which 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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA & EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
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	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
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 successfully mainstreamed other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The evaluation will examine this project's contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

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.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the

² 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](#)

recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

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

The total duration of the evaluation will be 29 working days for the international consultant over a time period of 12 weeks from 12 July to 31 October 2016 according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	15 July 2016
Evaluation Mission	15 days	26 Aug 2016
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	16 Sept 2016
Final Report	2 days	14 Oct 2016

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: 15 July 2016	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: 26 Aug 2016	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: 16 Sept 2016	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 14 Oct 2016	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 **2 independent consultants (1 team leader/ international evaluator and national evaluator)**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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 International Consultant will serve as the Team Leader and will be responsible for the final deliverable of the TE inception report, draft report, and final report.

International Consultant/ Team Leader Required Experience:

Education:

- A post-secondary/advanced degree (Masters level or higher) in biological sciences, biodiversity conservation, environmental sciences, evaluation, or a related subject

Experience:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in biodiversity conservation, national park / protected area management, ecosystem-based management;
- Minimum of 5 years experience evaluations (with UNDP and/or GEF-financed projects is an advantage)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)

Responsibilities:

- Documentation review
- Leading TE Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on the division of labor within the team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of base practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of 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

National Consultant Required Experience:

Education:

- A higher education degree (Bachelors level or higher) in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences, biological sciences, biodiversity conservation, environmental sciences, or a related subject.

Experience:

- Minimum 10 years of experience in project development and implementation.
- Minimum 5 years of experience in project evaluation.
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Familiarity with Thai national development policies, programmes and projects.

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

APPLICATION PROCESS (NATIONAL CONSULTANT/ TEAM SPECIALIST)

All application materials should be submitted to the by email to Nisakorn.puangkamalard@undp.org by CoB 25 May 2016. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)³ provided by UNDP;
- CV** and a **Personal History Form (P11 form)**⁴ with indication of the e-mail and phone contact;
- 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)
- 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

³

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

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

ANNEX TWO TERMINAL EVALUATION FIELD MISSION ITINERARY

August 2016

	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 BKK Arrival	8 UNDP/PSC @ UNDP	9 PMU/ DNP @ DNP	10 Regional Conservation Office no.2 (Sriracha)	11 Khao Chamao National Park	12 BKK *Mother Day- Holiday	13 Weekend
14 Weekend	15 Tarutao NP	16 Tarutao NP	17 WEFCOM @ DNP	18 Doi Inthanon NP	19 Doi Inthanon NP	20 Weekend
21 Weekend	22 BKK	23 BKK	24 BKK	25 BKK	26 Wrap-up meeting @ DNP	27 Depart from BKK
28	29	30	31			

8 August 2016 @ UNDP

- 9.30-11.00 Briefing by UNDP
 11.00-12.00 Interview: Ms. Radda Larpnun, Project Manager
 13.30-15.00 Interview: CATSPA Project Board Members
 1. Ms. Chomphoonut Chuangchote, Office of National Economic and Social Development Board
 2. Mr. Apichat Rattanasri, Bureau of Budget
 3. Mr. Wayupong Jitvijak, WWF
 15.00-16.00 Interview: Mr. Panuwat Boonyanan, Former Project Coordinator (via Skype)

9 August 2016 @ DNP

- 8.00-9.00 Depart from Royal Princess Hotel to DNP by van
 9.00-12.00 Briefing and interview: DNP & PMU
 13.30-14.30 Interview: Ms. Piyathip Eawpanich, CATSPA Consultant
 Protected area system plan
 14.30-15.30 Interview: Mr. Thammanoon Temchai, Petchburi National Park Research Centre
 Natural Water Evaluation in Eastern Forest Complex Project
 15.30-16.30 Go back to the hotel

Eastern Forest Complex

10 – 11 August 2016 :2 days 1 nights

Day 1 – 10 August		
8.30 – 10.30	Travel from Bangkok to Protected Area Regional Office 2, in Sri-Racha District, Chonburi by van	
10.30 – 12.00	Briefing on the overall implementation of projects: 1. Wild Elephant Management and Wild Elephant Management Fund in Buffer Zone Area of Khao Chamao National Park and Ang-Rue Nai Wildlife Sanctuary 2. Land Use Database Development for Improved Land Use Planning Decision 3. SMART Patrol	1. Director, Wildlife Protection Division, PA Regional Office 2 2 .Director, National Parks Division, PA Regional Office 2
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch	
13.00 – 15.00	Travel to Khao Chamao-Khao Wong National Park	
15.00 – 16.00	Briefing on the overall implementation of CATSPA pilot projects in EFCOM	Ms. Jitwadee Khunwongsa, CATSPA Field Coordinator
<i>Stay overnight at Khrua Rimnam Tharn Chamao Resort, Chamao District, Rayong</i>		
Day 2 – 11 August		
9.00 – 10.00	Interview key stakeholders of SMART Patrol project at Khao Chamao-Khao Wong National Park	Mr. Pornchai Kamnung, Superintendent of Klong Krua Wai Wildlife Sanctuary
10.00 – 11.00	Interview key stakeholders of Khao Kittchakoot Participatory Tourism Management Project at Khao Chamao-Khao Wong National Park	1. Mr. Nipon Pinyo, Superintendent of Kitchakoot National Park 2. Mr. Kittisak Rattanadadas, Deputy Superintendent of Kitchakoot National Park
11.00 – 13.00	Lunch	
13.00 – 14.30	Interview key stakeholder of the Participatory Mechanism of Protected Area Committee for Protected Area Management and Sustainability in Eastern Forest Complex	1. Phrakru Prachotthammaphirom, Superior of Wangsilathammaram Temple 2 .Mr. Noch Charndueykit, Chairman of EFCOM PAC Committee 3. Mr. Samphan Chandam, Ph.D.
14.30 – 17.30	Travel back to Bangkok	

Tarutao National Park

15 -16 August 2015 :2 days 1 night

Day 1 – 15 August		
8.20 – 9.45	Suvarnabhumi Airport – Hat Yai by TG 2269	
10.00 – 12.00	Travel from Hat Yai Airport to Tarutao National Park by van	
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch	
13.00 – 14.30	Briefing and interview with key stakeholders on Buoy Mooring project	Mr. Panaphol Chivasereechol, Superintendent of Tarutao National Park

14.30 – 16.00	Interview stakeholders of Tarutao National Park Conservation Fund Mechanism	1. Ms. Supaporn Prempre, Superintendent of Marine National Park Innovation Centre 3, Trang Province 2. Mr. Aladin Pakbara, staff of Marine National Park Innovation Centre 3, Trang Province
	<i>Stay overnight at Bara Resort, Langu District, Satul</i>	
	Day 2 – 16 August	
9.30 – 11.00	Briefing and interview with key stakeholders on Marine SMART Patrol project	1. Mr. Prarop Plang-ngan, Superintendent of Marine National Park Innovation Centre 2, Phuket Province 2. Mr. Krit Thammasorn, CATSPA Research Assistant
11.00 – 13.00	Travel to Hatyai airport)Lunch on the way(
16.25 – 17.45	Hat Yai Airport – Suvarnabhumi Airport By TG2266	

Western Forest Complex

17 August 2016: At DNP, Bangkok

	Day 1 – 17 August	
10.00 – 12.00	Briefing and interview with key stakeholders of project :Mae Wong-Klonglan-Huay Kha Khaeng Buffer Zone Management	1. Mr. Sompoch Maneerat, Superintendent of Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary 2. Mr. Udom Klabsawang, Former CATSPA Field Coordinator 3. Mr. Detch Chiewketwit, Chief of Khlonghueywei Village 4. Mr. Manop Nuanchawee, Chief of Phasubplu Village
13.30 – 14.30	Briefing and interview with key stakeholders of projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Klong Lan National Park Management Plan Development • Klong Lan Buffer Zone Management 	1. Mr. Sattha Kulthong, Superintendent of Khlong Lan National Park 2. Mr. Nuwieng Nuanphum, Chief of Petchniyom Village
14.30 – 15.30	Briefing and interview with key stakeholder of Natural Resources Dependency and Forest Use Evaluation in Communities around Buffer Zone Area Project	Mr. Komchettha Jarungpan, Pitsanulok National Park Research Centre

Doi Inthanon National Park

18-19 August 2016 :2 days 1 night

	Day 1 – 18 August	
7.55 – 9.15	Suvarnabhumi Airport – Chiangmai Airport by TG102	
9.30 – 12.30	Travel to Inthanon National Park (Lunch on the way)	
13.00 – 15.00	Briefing and interview with key stakeholders of projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doi Inthanon Conservation Trust Fund Mechanism • Collaboration project for Doi Inthanon Conservation 	1. Mr. Pornthep Charoensuebsakul, Superintendent of Doi Inthanon National Park 2. Mr. Jiradet Boonmak, Deputy Superintendent of Doi Inthanon National Park

		3. Mr. Wutthipong Dongkamfu, Deputy Superintendent of Doi Inthanon National Park
15.00 – 16.00	Briefing and interview with key stakeholders of Lady Slipper Orchid and Rhododendron Reintroduction Project	Mr. Tossaporn Thanami, Chief of Lady Slipper Orchid Conservation Project under Royal Initiative of His Majesty the King
	<i>Stay overnight at Royal Project</i>	
	Day – 19 August	
8.30 – 11.00	Visit area for slipper orchid and Rhododendron reintroduction at Kiew Mae Pan	Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Doi Inthanon National Park
11.00 – 14.30	Travel from Doi Inthanon to Chiang Mai	
14.30 – 15.30	Meeting and interview with key stakeholders of Doi Inthanon Conservation Trust Fund Project (Venue: TBC)	1. Mr. Pornchai Jitnawasathein, Chairman of Doi Inthanon Conservation Trust Fund 2. Mr. Boonyok Puangsoonthorn, Vice-chairman of Doi Inthanon Conservation Trust Fund
19.20 – 20.30	Chiangmai Airport-Suvarnabhumi Airport by TG117	

26 August 2016 @ DNP

13.30-15.30 Wrap-up Meeting

ANNEX THREE LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Name	Position	Organization
Date: 8 August 2016 @ UNDP		
1 Ms. Sutharin Koonphol	Programme Specialist	UNDP Thailand
2 Ms. Lisa Farroway	UNDP BRH	
3 Ms. Radda Larpnun	CATSPA Project Manager	UNDP Thailand
4 Ms. Chomphoonut Chuangchote	CATSPA Project Board Member	NESDB
5 Mr. Apichat Rattanasri	CATSPA Project Board Member	Bureau of Budget
6 Mr. Wayupong Jitvijak	CATSPA Project Board Member	WWF
7 Mr. Panuwat Boonyanan	Former CATSPA Project Coordinator	

Date: 9 August 2016 @ DNP

Morning session

1 Mr. Songtham Suksawang	CATSPA Project Director	DNP
2 Mr. Ariya Chuachom	Forestry Technical Officer - Senior Professional Level	DNP
3 Ms. Wasa Suthipibool	Forestry Technical Officer - Senior Professional Level	DNP
4 Ms. Hatairat Nukool	Forestry Technical Officer - Professional Level	DNP
5 Mr. Komkrit Setbubpha	Forestry Technical Officer - Professional Level & CATSPA Project Manager	DNP
6 Ms. Sunee Saksuae	Forestry Technical Officer - Professional Level	DNP
7 Ms. Supattra Thongpetch	Forestry Technical Officer	DNP
8 Mr. Tawee Noothong	Advisor	CATSPA
9 Ms. Kunsuree Yimsaree	Project Coordinator	CATSPA
10 Ms. Pornthip Changyam	Communication Consultant	CATSPA
11 Mr. Watchara Salee	Forestry Technical Officer	DNP
12 Ms. Chupthida Theerapachon	Forestry Technical Officer	DNP

Afternoon session

13 Ms. Piyathip Eawpanich	Protected Area Policy Specialist	Consultant to CATSPA
14 Mr. Thammanoon Themchai	Forestry Technical Officer - Professional Level	DNP

EFCOM

Date: 10 August 2016

Morning session

1 Mr. You Senatham	Director	Protected Area Regional Office 2
2 Mr. Somboon Therabanditkul	Director, Wildlife Protection Division	Protected Area Regional Office 2
3 Mr. Sumeth Saithong	Director, National Parks Division	Protected Area Regional Office 2

Afternoon session

4 Ms. Jitwadee Khunwongsa	Field Coordinator	CATSPA
---------------------------	-------------------	--------

Date: 11 August 2016

Morning session

1 Mr. Pornchai Kamnung	Superintendent	Klong Krua Wai Wildlife Sanctuary
2 Mr. Kittisak Rattanadadas	Former Deputy Superintendent	Kitchakoot National Park

Afternoon session

3 Phrakru Prachotthammaphirom	Superior	Wangsilathamaram Temple
4 Mr. Noch Charndueykit,	Chairman of EFCOM PAC Committee	
5 Mr. Samphan Chandam	EFCOM PAC Committee	
6 Mr. Jankom Komkham		

7 Mr. Samphan Pholpho Superintendent Khao Chamao-Khao Wong National Park

Tarutao National Park

Date: 15 August 2016

1 Mr. Panaphol Chiwasereechol Superintendent Tarutao National Park
2 Ms. Supaporn Prempree Superintendent Marine National Park Innovation Centre 3, Trang Province

3 Mr. Aladin Pakbara Marine National Park Innovation Centre 3, Trang Province

Date: 16 August 2016

4 Mr. Prarop Plang-ngan Superintendent Marine National Park Innovation Centre 2, Phuket Province

5 Mr. Krit Thammasorn CATSPA Research Assistant CATSPA

WEFCOM

Date: 17 August 2016

Morning session

1 Mr. Sompoch Maneerat Superintendent Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary

2 Mr. Udom Klabsawang Former CATSPA Field Coordinator

3 Mr. Apiluck Khanta Khlonghueyway Village

4 Mr. Manop Nuanchawee Chief of Subphaplu Village

Afternoon session

5 Mr. Sattha Kulthong Superintendent Khlong Lan National Park

6 Mr. Nuwieng Nuanphum Chief of Petchniyom Village

7 Mr. Komchettha Jarungpan Pitsanulok National Park Research Centre

Doi Inthanon

Date: 18 August 2016

1 Mr. Pornthep Charoensuebsakul Superintendent Doi Inthanon National Park

2 Mr. Jiradet Boonmak Deputy Superintendent Doi Inthanon National Park

3 Mr. Wutthipong Dongkamfu Deputy Superintendent Doi Inthanon National Park

4 Mr. Tossaporn Thanami Chief of Lady Slipper Orchid Conservation Project under Royal Initiative of His Majesty the King

Date: 19 August 2016

1 Mr. Pornchai Jitnawasathein Chairman of Doi Inthanon Conservation Trust Fund

2 Mr. Boonyok Puangsoonthorn Vice-chairman of Doi Inthanon Conservation Trust Fund

ANNEX FOUR: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Project Identification Form (PIF) 2007 for Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System
Project Initiation Plan for Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System signed 24 June 2008
Project Document (ProDoc) for Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System PIMS 3825: GEFSEC ID: 3517 signed 27th September 2010
Quarterly Project Progress Report: January March 16
Quarterly Project Progress Report: July – September 15
Quarterly Project Progress Report: April – June 15
Quarterly Project Progress Report: January March 15
Quarterly Project Progress Report: October – December 14
Project Implementation Review (PIR): 2015
Project Implementation Review (PIR): 2014
Project Implementation Review (PIR): 2013
METT Project Tracking Tool 2015
METT Project Tracking Tool 2016
UNDP – GEF Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand's Protected Area System Mid Term Review Report July 2015

ANNEX FIVE: EVALUATION QUESTION MATRIX

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance - How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
Is the project in line with UNDP and the Global Environmental Facility's (GEF) policies and strategies? i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o UNCBD o GEF biodiversity focal area o United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change 	Project planning and approval documents.	Project documentation. UNDP documents, UNDP managers. Related National Policies and Plans	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Are the original objectives still relevant at the time of evaluation? Have significant changes in the project context or GEF policies been retrofitted to the design?	Changes made in MTR Changes to monitoring framework and results	Project documents, UNDP documents, Stakeholder interviews. Project annual and quarterly reports,	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Is the project consistent with the National Government and the Regional Government's strategies, policies and plans? ie Thailand's environment and sustainable development objectives?	Programme implementation is consistent with national / international commitments to biodiversity conservation	Project documentation. Government reports. Government policy, laws and regulations. Stakeholder interviews.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
How compatible is the project with strategies, policies and plans in economic development and environment led sectors?	Programme implementation is consistent with National Socio-Economic Development Plan and National Environmental Development Plan	Project documentation. The 10 th National Socio-Economic Development Plan and the National Environmental Development Plan of the same period. Stakeholder interviews.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Was the project design flexible enough to adapt to emerging challenges?	Changes made to monitoring framework	Project documentation. Annual and quarterly reports. MTR report. Stakeholder interviews.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	Crossover of information and experience.	Project documentation. Documentation from other	Document analysis; Stakeholder

	Replication in other projects	projects. UNDP managers. Stakeholder interviews.	consultation
Were the project's beneficiaries appropriately targeted and were their specific needs accommodated in the project design?	Level of participation within communities at design and implementation. Perceived level of community ownership in project / survey.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews. Annual and quarterly reports. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Were there any innovative aspects to either project design or implementation that contributed to better project efficiency, effectiveness and overall impact?	Actions taken. Reduction in implementation bottlenecks, Adaptive management applied.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved	Project implementation results.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews. Annual and quarterly reports. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Were project risks identified in the PIF sufficiently mitigated in the design (e.g., failure to secure necessary institutional coordination arrangements, non compliance with certification, climate related risks, civil strife)	Risks identified and mitigated. Monitoring tools developed and in use.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews. Annual and quarterly reports. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	Monitoring tools developed and in use. Regular reporting to Project Board, used for decision-making.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	Project implementation results.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews. Annual and quarterly reports. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
To what extent were stakeholders – including the project implementing partner, service providers and the expected beneficiaries – involved in the design of the project, and what was their sense of ownership?	Level of participation within communities at design and implementation. Perceived level of community ownership in project / survey.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews. Annual and quarterly reports. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation

Was the rationale for this project based on sound science and understanding of the ecosystem services and their interrelationships with key habitats and species their relationships with local communities and their livelihoods?	Biodiversity status reports Perceived level of community ownership in project / survey.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Was the government (national and provincial) actively involved in the design?	Project design documents and associated reports	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Was the design process participatory? Did it take into the concerns and needs of local government and local communities?	Levels of community participation in planning and implementation. To what extent have resource rights / tenure issues been addressed. Level of effort made for capacity building in communities.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
How well were the project's resources used in achieving the expected outcomes?	Cost management reporting.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	Levels of co-operation assessment.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	Cost management reporting.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	Levels of community participation in planning and implementation. Level of effort made for capacity building in communities. Community project outputs.	Stakeholder interviews. Project monitoring documents Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	Results of evaluation.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Did UNDP and implementing agency take the initiative to suitably modify	Problems identified in annual and	Stakeholder interviews.	Document analysis;

project design (if required) during implementation in response to any changes in circumstance or emerging opportunities?	quarterly reports and implemented interventions.	Project documentation. MTR	Stakeholder consultation
Was the logical and monitoring framework adequate to address identified challenges for project and were the project outcomes and outputs measurable and achievable within the project timeframe?	Evaluation of monitoring procedures. Monitoring mechanisms and their effectiveness.	Stakeholder interviews. Project monitoring documents Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Has adequate staffing/resource given for project management?	Results monitoring.	Stakeholder interviews. Project monitoring documents Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Did the implementing agency initiate any modifications in response to changing circumstances or opportunities?	Results monitoring.	Stakeholder interviews. Project monitoring documents Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Was prompt action taken to ensure the timely implementation of recommendations from the mid-term review and resolve any implementation concerns?	Changes made to working arrangements in line with MTR	Stakeholder interviews. Project monitoring documents Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Have the flow of funds and procurement procedures been suitable for ensuring timely implementation?	Planned work started and completed on time	Stakeholder interviews. Project monitoring documents Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Have counterpart funds been provided adequately and on time?	Planned work started and completed on time	Stakeholder interviews. Project monitoring documents Project documentation. MTR	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Did UNDP mobilize sufficient technical expertise in the project design?	Issues related to project design identified.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	What are project results set against planned outputs	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder

			consultation
What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?	Experience of stakeholders / project partners during implementation.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Are the implementing agency and supporting organizations sufficiently resourced to continue the Programme after project completion?	Exit strategy	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? What are they?	Socio-political analysis of current national / regional situation	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Are there ongoing activities or external factors that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? What are they?	EIA Economic development plans Existing commercial operations	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. EIA reports	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
How might a second phase of the project build on the project successes and address its identified deficiencies?	Stakeholder consultation Project reports	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared?	Exit strategy. Community participation in management / community ownership .	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed?	Exit strategy	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
To what extent was an integrated conservation and development model effectively been developed and replicated beyond the project sites?	How many projects or interventions used project experience?	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation

Has an exit strategy been prepared for the project and agreed upon by the key partners?	Project documentation.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
What (if any) inter-agency co-ordination arrangements are proposed to be put in place after project completion? How will they work efficiently, effectively and sustainably?	Exit strategy	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Are the economic activities promoted by the project generating economic profits or losses (net of subsidies)? What is their likely resilience to future shocks?	Project reports Economic analysis	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. National / regional economic studies.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Did the implementing agency put in place an effective M&E system and does it generate information on performance and impact that is useful for project management to take decisions?	Effectiveness of log frame Reporting system in place	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. Monitoring Framework Monitoring documentation National / regional economic studies.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Did the institutional and behavioural changes, expected at design stage, occur to ensure scaling up of project outputs?	Biodiversity impact studies Economic impact studies	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements?	Biodiversity reports EIA	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. National / regional biodiversity studies.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems?	Biodiversity reports EIA	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. National / regional biodiversity studies.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?	Biodiversity reports EIA	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. National / regional biodiversity studies.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Has the local communities' perceptions of the need for ecological protection changed?	Studies / research on attitude changes. Level of perceived community ownership of project.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. Community attitude surveys National / regional biodiversity	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation

		studies.	
How has the project impacted on overall management of the selected eco-systems? Has the project contributed to wider awareness of the required global efforts to protect these eco-systems and their species?	Biodiversity monitoring	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	Replication of project components occurring.	Project documentation. Stakeholder interviews.	Stakeholder consultation Document analysis;
How has the nature of poverty in the impacted communities changed in response to the project (is progress sustainable?)	Increase in incomes against pre project base line. Level of community ownership in project.	Stakeholder interviews. Project documentation. National / regional economic studies.	Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation

ANNEX SIX: 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 Form⁵

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

Name of Consultant: Andrew Sillitoe

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Trefeglwys, Cymru UK 15 September 2016

Signature: 

ANNEX SEVEN: 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: _____