

**Mid-Term Review**  
**UNDP-GEF Project “Conserving Habitats for**  
**Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production**  
**Landscapes in Thailand”**  
**(PIMS#4839) (Project ID: 00091787)**

**Final Report**

Prepared by.

Hari Ramalu Ragavan, International Consultant

Walaitat Worakul, National Consultant

## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF MTR AND OBJECTIVES	9
1.2 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.0
1.3 STRUCTURE OF MTR REPORT	11
<b>2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3 FINDINGS</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.1 PROJECT STRATEGY</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1.1 PROJECT DESIGN	13
3.1.2 RESULTS FRAMEWORK / LOGFRAME:	15
<b>3.2 PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS</b>	<b>20</b>
3.2.1 PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES ANALYSIS	20
3.2.2 REMAINING BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES	30
<b>3.3 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>30</b>
3.3.1 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS	30
3.3.2 WORK PLANNING	31
3.3.3 FINANCE AND CO-FINANCE	32
3.3.4 PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS	33
3.3.5 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	34
3.3.6 REPORTING	35
3.3.7 COMMUNICATIONS:	35
<b>3.4 SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<b>36</b>
3.4.1 FINANCIAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY	36
3.4.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY:	37
3.4.3 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY	37
3.4.4 ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY	37
<b>4 CONCLUSIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1 CONCLUSIONS	37
4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	40
<b>5 ANNEXES</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
5.1 MTR TERMS OF REFERENCE	43
5.2 MTR EVALUATION MATRIX	52
5.3 RATING SCALES	53
5.4 MTR MISSION ITINERARY	54
5.5 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	59
5.6 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	60
5.7 UNDP-GEF MID-TERM REVIEW AUDIT TRAIL (ANNEXED SEPARATELY)	63
5.8 SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM	68
5.9 SIGNED MTR FINAL REPORT CLEARANCE FORM	70

## Abbreviations

APR	Annual Progress Report
BCST	Bird Conservation Society of Thailand
BEDO	Biodiversity Based Economy Development Office
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DMCR	Department of Marine and Coastal Resources
DNP	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plants Conservation
DTCP	Department of Town and Country Planning
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessments
ES	Endangered Species
ESC	Eastern Sarus Crane
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
KKCC	Khok Kham Conservation Club
KPI	Key Performance Indicators
LDD	Land Development Department
LPC	Local Project Committee
MoAC	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Mol	Ministry of Interior
Molnd	Ministry of Industry
MONRE	Ministry of Natural Resource and the Environment
MOTS	Ministry of Tourism and Sport
N-ACT	North Andaman Community Tourism Network
NEB	National Environment Board
NEF	National Environment Fund
NEQA	National Environmental Quality Ac
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
ONEP	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning
PA	Protected Areas
PAO	Provincial Administrative Organization
PIO	Provincial Irrigation Office
PONRE	Provincial Office of Natural Resources and the Environment
RFD	Royal Forestry Department
RID	Royal Irrigation Department
SBS	Spoon-billed Sandpiper
SEIA	Strategic Environmental Impact Assessments
TAO	Tambon Administrative Office
ZPO	Zoological Parks Organisation

## Executive Summary

### Project Information Table

Project Title	Conserving habitats for globally important flora and fauna in production landscapes UNDP- PIMS 4839, GEF ID: 0005512
MTR time frame and date of MTR report	November 2018 – February 2019 Draft Report –28 January 2018 Final Report –14 Mar 2019
Region and countries included in the project	Thailand
GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program	BD1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area System
Executing Agency	UNDP
Implementing Partner	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)
Other project partners	Zoological Park Organisation (ZPO) International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Thailand
MTR members	Hari Ramalu Ragavn and Walitat Worakul

### Project Description

Project: Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes (PIMS 4839) aims to mainstream the conservation of globally important and endangered species into the management of production landscapes through improved management of critical habitats.

These will be achieved through two Outcomes.

Outcome 1 focuses on developing and strengthening enabling framework and capacity at the national level to manage Endanger Species (ES) in productive landscapes. This includes the development of a legislative, regulatory and enforcement framework to guide endangered species (ES) and critical habitat conservation and management as well as capacity building within key ministries and agencies to enhance cross sector coordination in critical habitat management, and to effectively monitor critical habitats and ES to better inform decision makers.

Outcome 2 aims to demonstrate critical habitat management for three Endangered Species, i.e. the Spoon-billed Sandpiper, the Eastern Sarus Crane, and the Water Onion in three distinct geographical locations, namely Samut Sakhorn, Burirum and Ranong provinces. Within each location the project also develops the capacity of local authorities, communities, private sector groups, and NGOs to develop environmentally friendly goods and services, which can provide a sound economic basis for ongoing critical habitat management and economic development.

The project is a four-year project implemented by Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) while the Zoological Park Organisation (ZPO) serves as Responsible Party. The Project Document was signed in September 2015, project

implementation started in December the same year and the expected ending date is September 2019.

The total project budget is USD 12,896,137 of which USD 1,758,904 is from GEF, USD 10,997,233 from the Thai government, USD 100,000 from CSO and USD 40,000 from UNDP.

During the last three decades, Thailand has undergone a rapid process of development that has lifted large numbers of people from poverty. This development has been based on rapid processes of industrialization, urbanization, and by intensified agricultural production and fishing. In each area development has relied heavily on the country's abundant and diverse natural resources but has also resulted in degradation of land, and the loss of natural habitats. These challenges have presented a number of threats to the maintenance of biodiversity and the survival of endangered species. The IUCN's Red List notes that Thailand has over 575 globally threatened species. Thailand's Country Red list data expands this list further to identify a total of 1,059 threatened species. The three specific species which are the focus of this project include the Spoon-billed Sandpiper, the Eastern Sarus Crane, and the Water Onion.

The Spoon-billed Sandpiper (SBS) was listed as Critically Endangered in 2012 as it has an extremely small population that is rapidly decreasing in size. The main factors driving this decline are habitat loss in its breeding, passage and wintering grounds that are compounded by disturbance, hunting and the effects of climate change. More significant within Thailand is the ongoing conversion of traditional salt-pans to deeper sided aquaculture ponds, changes in the management regimes of salt pans and complete conversions of land-use related to industrialization.

Eastern Sarus Crane is listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List because it is suspected to have suffered a rapid population decline, which is projected to continue, due to widespread reductions in the extent and quality of its wetland habitats, exploitation and the effects of pollution. A combination of these threats resulted in the species becoming extinct within Thailand except for a few individuals in zoo. The Zoological Parks Organisation (ZPO) have now reintroduced 36 individuals back into their natural environment at three wetland complexes in Buriram Province.

The Water Lily is endemic to Thailand and has a very restricted range in southern Thailand. The species has been identified as a keystone species in its aquatic habitats, providing important habitat for native freshwater fish species such as the Soro Brook Carp (*Tor soro*), which use it as a habitat to lay eggs. Other aquatic species such as water snails and frogs also use it as breeding habitat while other native fish eat the young leaves of Water Onion. Originally found on the coastal plain of southern Thailand, the species is now confined to isolated patches on a few rivers and streams in Phang Nga and Ranong Provinces. The population is severely fragmented by habitat loss and there have been rapid population declines in some areas with local extinction reported in some streams within its range.

### **Project Progress Summary**

Table below presents the MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary for the project. The general conclusion that can be made is that the project's relevance, commitment and capacity of the project responsible parties, and sustainability is high given the evidence in the reports and the stakeholders consultation. Improvements are needed in activities implementation and communications between parties.

However, due to the delay in the implementation of project activities, targets achievements are behind schedule and the delivery rate is only at 36% of the project budget with only 9 months remaining of the 4-year duration.

### MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the Conserving habitats for globally important flora and fauna in production landscapes project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective: To mainstream globally important biodiversity species conservation into production sectors through improved management of critical habitats.  Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Two indicators are used to measure the impact of the objective. Both cannot be measured as there are no sufficient project activities that could produce the outputs in the results framework. As such the development objective and implementation progress is lacking.  In terms of stakeholder's participation and inputs to the project objective, there are the indication that if project implementation according to the revised work plan by IUCN is done in timely manner, project objective, with some modification can be achieved.  At this point, it is difficult to measure if the threats and barriers to achieve the objective are still persistent or not.
	Outcome 1: Enabling framework and capacity to manage ES in productive landscapes strengthened Strengthening on-ground conservation actions and wildlife protection  Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There are 4 indicators of achievement for this outcome. These are related to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the ES Bill,</li> <li>2. species management plans,</li> <li>3. ES integrated provincial plans, and</li> <li>4. ONEP's capacity.</li> </ol> <p>The study to review legislation related to ES and habitat protection as reported at 30 June 2017 has been conducted but is not 100% complete due to the change of project responsible parties. Draft Bill is not ready yet.</p> <p>While some activities are done for 2 and 3, especially through ZPO and ONEP, there are no activities to support 1 and 4 effectively.</p>
	Outcome 2: Critical Habitat management demonstrated for three Endangered Species  Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There are 2 indicators of achievement for this outcome. These are related to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Area of production landscape that integrate environmental friendly production, and</li> <li>2. Stability of the species population.</li> </ol> <p>Awareness, technology/methods of production, and marketing opportunities are being identified and implemented. Partially due to the similar engagement done in the past by other projects and party due to efforts taken in Buriram.</p> <p>Eco-tourism opportunity is clearly identified but not being effectively supported by BEDO and Tourism authorities. A lot of work needed for tourism activities strengthening.</p>
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The project has experienced significant delays due to the gap in the project management capacity as there was no PM for nearly one year. The delivery in terms of expenditures is low. The adaptive management by the project to appoint a new RP to assume the overall project management and to deliver the outcomes is commendable but was done significantly late. The timing of the appointment of the new RP was delayed due to various factors including initial call for proposal did not result in any suitable

		<p>candidate, and the delay in contracting IUCN.</p> <p>The project did not monitor tracking tools, co-financing and communication mechanisms.</p> <p>LPC is not operating effectively yet.</p> <p>There are improvements needed for all seven components of this measure; management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	Moderately Likely (ML)	<p>Assessment of sustainability at the midterm considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes.</p> <p>There are no major obstacles or barriers when it comes to the stakeholders' cooperation or input for the project to progress and achieve the outcomes.</p> <p>There are many commitments at the provincial level and at the national level to continue to provide budgets and financial support to ES in future.</p> <p>The only risk that can be considered critical is the socio-economic risk of communities and business interest in Samutsakhon. If urgent intervention of the project is not institutionalized, there could be drastic changes to the ES habitat there.</p>

## Recommendations

**Table 4: Recommendation Table**

Category		Recommendation	Responsible Party	Time frame
Results Framework	1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise indicator/baseline/targets</li> <li>Target for indicator 2 of the project objective is changed to “no overall decline in species status of SPB, WL and ESC” from “No overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand”.</li> <li>Target for indicator 1 of Outcome1 is changed to “draft Bill recommended to NEB after consultation with stakeholders from “Bill approved by Cabinet”</li> <li>Target for indicator 2 of Outcome 1 is changed to “landuse zoning for ES and critical habitat at these 5 provinces completed and submitted to the TCPD for inclusion in the provincial plans” from “At least 5 provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas”</li> <li>Indicator 4 of Outcome 1 to include indicators 5, 9 and 10 in addition to the current score for indicator 2,3 and 11.</li> <li>Baseline for Indicator 2 of Outcome 2 on Spoon-billed Sandpiper to be reduce to 2 from 4 at pilot location in Khok Kham. (This is in line with the suggestion made at the Inception)</li> <li>Target for indicator 3 of Outcome 2 is ambiguous – “No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location”. It should be measured in the form of “ha pan salt” or “mudflats km2” or “ha of new aquaculture and development areas” between the start of the project and end of project, within the habitat in Khok Kham location. MTR</li> </ul>	PMU and Project Board	February 2019

		<p>team recommends that BCST/IUCN/ONEP to suggest this in the next PB based on the information available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline for indicator 3 of Outcome 2 on number of "wild Water Onion collected to exported out of Thailand" seems to be outdated from 2009 figures. There should have been updated data on this from Plan Quarantine Officials. MTR recommends that the baseline level use 2014/15/16 figure.</li> </ul>		
Project Management	2.	The project needs a no-cost extension of 6 months in order to have adequate time to complete all the activities of the revised work plan.	PB and UNDP	The new end of project date should be revised to March 2020
	3.	The regular communications between PMU and ONEP must be enhanced. They should meet every fortnight to discuss updates on implementation of activities without waiting for the PB's meetings to resolve issues.	PMU/ONEP	On-going
	4.	PB must meet more often to ensure that the progress of the project and expedite decision making. In the current circumstances, the PB must meet at least three times this year to facilitate this.	PB	On-going
	5.	The project should urgently record the co-financing from the government – ONEP and ZPO, and other institutions like TEI, IUCN to reflect the contribution and commitment of Thailand toward this global biodiversity benefits in the form of ES conservation. The MTR team has provided examples of template to record in-kind co-financing for the use of the project. UNDP's co-financing should also be recorded.	PMU/UNDP	On-going
	6.	The GEF tracking tool, Capacity Assessment Scorecard need to be completed immediately in early 2019 and then do another one at the end of the project.	UNDP/ONEP/PMU	February 2019 and end of project
ES recovery and conservation plans at 3 sites	7.	The SBP conservation is the most difficult task for this project/Thailand. There are two forms of conservation reliance - whether management is directed toward populations or toward extrinsic threats. In the case of SBP both are very challenging. As such, there should be greater emphasis in the form of additional funding and urgent land use plan discussion at Samutsakhon. . This additional funding is not from the project but the project should assist the LPC to mobilise funding from ONEP or other donors or private sector to pursue the design and approval and implementation of local land use plan that provides the habitat protection for SPB. A community empowerment specialist need to be appointed to form strong grouping of the community there to support the SBP conservation. The project should assist in appointing a community engagement specialist for this purpose.	PMU/IUCN	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019  1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019
	8.	For Water Onion, a tourist coordinator/specialist need to be appointed so that the community's aspiration for a social enterprise using ecotourism can support sustain the habitat as well as regeneration of WO. In addition, the local provincial government should consider providing "temporary occupation licence" to the community on the use of the public land for sustainable livelihood in order to enhance ownership to this effort.	PMU/IUCN/LAC	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019



	9.	In Buriram, the community are ready to create social enterprise to develop sustainable agriculture and to provide protection to ESC. The project should support the setting up of such entity.	PMU/ZPO	
Stakeholders' engagement	10.	The new Work Plan 2018-2019 should be verified with LAC and provincial stakeholders in order to get the support from them – the stakeholders need to know their roles, activities and budgets available for the remaining period of the project.	PMU/LAC	February 2019
	11.	The project should assist ONEP to set up the TWGs for outcome that involves direct functions of related agencies; TWG for eco-tourism, TWG for land use plans with TCP and TWG for Law with the AG office. The role of Tourism Authority and BEDO need to be redefined so that their involvement will be more meaningful and constructive through these TWGs. The TWGs should be responsible to report the achievements to the PB, instead of relying on the PMU. The RPs should not be driving the interagency coordination but rather facilitate this mechanism. The related agencies should be leading the TWGs. The TWGs will also benefit ONEP beyond the lifetime of the project to ensure the mainstreaming of biodiversity consideration in production landscapes in future.	PMU/PB/UNDP/ONEP	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019
Knowledge management and Communication	12.	Cross learning between the stakeholders in the 3 sites should be enhanced. There should be more field visits between them to learn from one another.	PMU/RPs/UNDP	On-going
	13.	Knowledge products need to be developed to showcase the actions and results of the project. For example, the gender dimension in some of the sites are very impressive. These stories need to be told in outreach products.		
	14.	Project webpage/Facebook/ need to be created as soon as possible to enhance the awareness and support the project.		
Sustainability	15.	The project should develop an exit plan for sustainability of the outcomes. This is especially with the revised target of the indicator for Outcome 1 from ES Bill approved to draft bill submitted to NEB.	PMU/RP/ONEP/PB/UNDP	On-going
	16.	Use the opportunity of the project to do capacity building of ONEP and the production landscape agencies on managing mainstreaming approach, including incentives and disincentive that can be incorporated into development plans of the agencies.		
	17.	The Local Advisory Committee should be institutionalised at the provincial level as the one-stop entity to organise and manage all ES species related funds, projects and activities from government, NGOs and private sector to synergise the ES conservation efforts.		

## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Purpose of MTR and Objectives**

“Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes” (PIMS#4839), is a project being implemented by Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP), of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) - Government of Thailand and supported by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with funding from GEF (Global Environment Facility).

This 4-year project started in September 2015 and is in its third year of implementation and has a planned end of date in September 2019. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). However, for medium and small project like this one, MTR is optional as per the guidance. The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability

The project’s objective is to mainstream the conservation of globally important and endangered biodiversity into the management of production landscapes through improved management of critical habitats. At the national level, it will develop a legislative, regulatory and enforcement framework to guide endangered species (ES) and critical habitat conservation and management. This will be supported by capacity building within key ministries and agencies to enhance cross sector coordination in critical habitat management, and to effectively monitor critical habitats and ES to better inform decision makers.

The project has a total budget of US\$ 12,896,137 (cash US\$1,758,904 from GEF, cash USD40,000 from UNDP, in kind US\$10,997,233 in co-financing from the Thai Government, and in kind USD100,000 from Civil Society).

### **1.2 Scope and Methodology**

The scope of the review is from the starting date of the project till 30 September 2018. The MTR was conducted between November 2018 and February 2019 by a team of evaluators consisting of an independent international consultant and an independent national consultant. The number of working days for the MTR by the team was 27 days each, with 10 days dedicated to the field mission in Thailand.

The MTR assess project progress against the following four main categories: (i) project strategy; (ii) progress towards results; (iii) project implementation and adaptive management; and, (iv) sustainability. The review was guided by the MTR Evaluation matrix, that provides the evaluation questions, indicators, sources and methodology against the four categories stated above. The review is based on the information and feedback from various stakeholder.

The MTR team engaged a collaborative and participatory approach in order to obtain feedback from the project implementers (ONEP, ZPO, IUCN), government counterparts at the Tambon level (Tambon Administrative Officers, provincial branch of Provincial Office of Natural

Resources (PONRE) , Wildlife Sanctuary, Non-hunting Area ) , NGOs (Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) and Bird Conservation Society of Thailand (BCST), local Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) at the field sites, UNDP Country Office, and UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers. The MTR team could not meet the GEF Focal point, Department of Town and Country Planning (DTCP), and Department of Tourism (DOT). Interviews in Bangkok and visits to project field sites has been agreed by the UNDP Thailand and the MTR team. A copy of the MTR itinerary is attached as Annex 1.

The sources of secondary data and information examined were:

- A wide variety of documents covering project design, implementation progress, monitoring and review including the Mid-Term Review, Annual Progress Report (APR), GEF Tracking Tools (GTT), reports/studies, National Development Plans, policies/ legislation/ regulations on biodiversity and endangered species management.
- Face-to-face consultations with a wide range of stakeholders, comparing information from different sources, such as documentation and interviews.
- Direct observations of project results and activities at the field sites, namely, Buriram, Ranong, Phang Nga and Samut Sakhon.

### **1.3 Structure of MTR Report**

The report is divided into 4 sections. Section 1 provides the introduction about the MTR, Section 2 provides background information on the project description and background context including the problems and threats that the project is dealing with and the project's objective, outcome and management arrangements, Section 3 is on the MTR findings for project strategy, progress towards results, project implementation and adaptive management and sustainability, and lastly Section 4 presents the conclusions and recommendations.

## **2 Project Description and Background Context**

### Thailand's Biodiversity and its Global Significance

Thailand is situated at the centre of the Indochinese Peninsula. With a total area of 513,120 km<sup>2</sup> (510,890 km<sup>2</sup> land and 2,230 km<sup>2</sup> water), the country can be divided into six biogeographical units with unique floral and faunal associations. Thailand's 15,000 plant species constitute 8% of the global plant species inventory which further includes 302 species of mammal, 928 of bird species, 350 reptile and 137 of amphibians. Its freshwater ecosystems, encompassing rivers, reservoirs, swamps and ponds, contain about 7% of the world's freshwater species count. Coastal ecosystems extend over an area of more than 2,000 km<sup>2</sup>

with 2,000 marine fish species accounting for 10% of the global marine fish species assemblage and over 11,900 species of marine invertebrates. The country's agro-ecosystems, which cover about one fifth of the country, support a range of biodiversity, including agro-biodiversity.

During the last three decades, Thailand has undergone a rapid process of development that has lifted large numbers of people from poverty. This development has been based on rapid

processes of industrialization, urbanization, and by intensified agricultural production and fishing. In each area development has relied heavily on the country's abundant and diverse natural resources but has also resulted in degradation of land, and the loss of natural habitats. These challenges have presented a number of threats to the maintenance of biodiversity and the survival of endangered species. The IUCN's Red List notes that Thailand has over 575 globally threatened species. Thailand's Country Red list data expands this list further to identify a total of 1,059 threatened species. The three specific species which are the focus of this project include the Spoon-billed Sandpiper, the Eastern Sarus Crane, and the Water Onion.

### **Threats to target species and root causes**

**Spoon-billed Sandpiper (*Eurynorhynchus pygmeus*)** The Spoon-billed Sandpiper (SBS) was listed as Critically Endangered in 2012 as it has an extremely small population that is rapidly decreasing in size. The main factors driving this decline are habitat loss in its breeding, passage and wintering grounds that are compounded by disturbance, hunting and the effects of climate change. More significant within Thailand is the ongoing conversion of traditional salt-pans to deeper sided aquaculture ponds, changes in the management regimes of salt pans and complete conversions of land-use related to industrialization.

**Eastern Sarus Crane (*Grus antigone sharpii*)**. The Sarus Crane is listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List because it is suspected to have suffered a rapid population decline, which is projected to continue, due to widespread reductions in the extent and quality of its wetland habitats, exploitation and the effects of pollution. A combination of these threats resulted in the species becoming extinct within Thailand except for a few individuals in zoo. The Zoological Parks Organisation (ZPO) have now reintroduced 36 individuals back into their natural environment at three wetland complexes in Buriram Province.

**Water Onion (*Crinum thaianum*)**. The Water Lily is endemic to Thailand and has a very restricted range in southern Thailand. The species has been identified as a keystone species in its aquatic habitats, providing important habitat for native freshwater fish species such as the Soro Brook Carp (*Tor soro*), which use it as a habitat to lay eggs. Other aquatic species such as water snails and frogs also use it as breeding habitat while other native fish eat the young leaves of Water Onion. Originally found on the coastal plain of southern Thailand, the species is now confined to isolated patches on a few rivers and streams in Phang Nga and Ranong Provinces. The population is severely fragmented by habitat loss and there have been rapid population declines in some areas with local extinction reported in some streams within its range.

### **Project description**

Project: Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes (PIMS 4839) aims to mainstream the conservation of globally important and endangered species into the management of production landscapes through improved management of critical habitats. These will be achieved through two Outcomes.

Outcome 1 focuses on developing and strengthening enabling framework and capacity at the national level to manage Endanger Species (ES) in productive landscapes. This includes the development of a legislative, regulatory and enforcement framework to guide endangered species (ES) and critical habitat conservation and management as well as capacity building within key ministries and agencies to enhance cross sector coordination in critical habitat management, and to effectively monitor critical habitats and ES to better inform decision makers.

Outcome 2 aims to demonstrate critical habitat management for three Endangered Species, i.e. the Spoon-billed Sandpiper, the Eastern Sarus Crane, and the Water Onion in three distinct geographical locations, namely Samut Sakhorn, Burirum and Ranong provinces. Within each location the project also develops the capacity of local authorities, communities, private sector groups, and NGOs to develop environmentally friendly goods and services, which can provide a sound economic basis for ongoing critical habitat management and economic development.

The project is a four-year project implemented by Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) while the Zoological Park Organisation (ZPO) serves as Responsible Party. The Project Document was signed in September 2015, project implementation started in December the same year and the expected ending date is September 2019.

The total project budget is USD 12,896,137 of which USD 1,758,904 is from GEF, USD 10,997,233 from the Thai government, USD 100,000 from CSO and USD 40,000 from UNDP.

### **3. Findings**

#### **3.1 Project Strategy**

##### **3.1.1 Project Design**

The project is designed with the intention that the long-term solution to the threats for ES conservation, lies in reforming the manner in which agricultural, forestry, aquaculture and other production activities are planned and regulated across different land units and tenure categories at the landscape scale in order to avoid, reduce and mitigate the pressures leading to ES biodiversity loss. This will be brought about through the 'mainstreaming' of biodiversity into existing land use planning and management approaches as well as commercial decision making and enterprise.

At the national level the project is trying to put in place the necessary planning and enforcement framework to mainstream ES conservation in the wider landscape. At the site level, the project intends to demonstrate through the development of land use plans and compliance monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans, the needs of the ES and especially its habitat requirements the long term conservation of the three target species. Further, innovative approaches to the development of biodiversity goods and services and the integration of their production within site level management plans will provide case study examples of how biodiversity and production can be effectively linked. These lessons will not only provide valuable examples for similar locations within Thailand but will also provide insight for regional and global efforts to conserve endangered species.

The barriers to the effective ES management are clearly identified at national level and for species specific. These include, inadequate planning and enforcement to mainstream ES

conservation in the wider landscape, and inadequate existing experience in integrating land-use planning and ES compatible land management. The project will reduce these barriers through legal context, land use planning and biodiversity friendly production methods by communities and local authorities.

The project design has not incorporated explicitly lessons learned from other relevant projects with the exception of the “Thailand’s National Capacity Self-assessment (NCSA 2010) project”. This is related to the capacity building of the ONEP within MONRE to effectively monitor and implement legislation and engagement of the private sector in environmental conservation.

However, the project design has identified three key on-going initiatives/projects as complementary to this project and suggests that the Project Management will forge links with these initiatives, build on their achievements and collaborate to the extent possible. These projects are:

- “Integrated Community-based Forest and Catchment Management through an Ecosystem Service Approach (CBFCM)” by UNDP/GEF project to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up integrated CBFCM practices in Thailand. This project is closely linked to Component 2 of the proposed project in regard to encourage local management and benefits from the natural resource management.
- “Catalyzing Sustainability of Thailand’s protected Area System” by UNDP/GEF project which aims to overcome barriers to sustainability of Thailand’s Protected Areas system through improving the management. The project focuses on Protected Areas (governance, enhancing institutional and individual capacities, assessing and testing revenue generation mechanisms and management approaches, and new models of PA) while the FF project focuses on mainstreaming biodiversity in productive and development sectors outside PAs, thereby complementing each other in the overall conservation of biodiversity in Thailand.
- “Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand’s Production Landscapes” by UNDP/GEF project which aims to strengthen national and local capacity for mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of ecologically important production landscapes by transforming the supply and market chain of biodiversity-based products.

A Technical Working Group is to be established to bring together technical experts on biodiversity conservation from all the above related projects to leverage synergies. This TWG has not been established and therefore lost the opportunity to learn from each on the way forward for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in Thailand.

The project supports the achievement of objectives and indicators for Eleventh National Economic and Social Development Plan, especially the focus on the need to restructure the economy towards inclusive growth (including a move towards environmentally friendly production) and to move the management of natural resources towards sustainability. It is noted that the results/impacts of this project will also contribute to the current Twelfth National Economic and Social Development Plan, 2017 – 2021 especially on Strategy 4: Strategy for Environmentally-Friendly Growth for Sustainable Development.

The project is also in line with the country’s Tourism Development Plan 2012-16, which focuses on the need to promote sustainable tourism, ensuring rehabilitation and protection of the environment as well as increased participation by local communities. In addition, the project supports the implementation of Thailand’s Action Plan (2009 – 2014) on wetland conservation, – including conservation of wetlands with significant international importance,

sustainable tourism, and ensuring rehabilitation and protection of the environment as well as increased participation by local communities. Further, the results/impacts of this project will contribute to the Second National Tourism Development Plan 2017-2021 on Strategy 1: Development of tourist attractions, products and services, including the encouragement of sustainability, environmental friendly, and Thai integrity of attractions.

The project is fully aligned with Thailand's "National Policies, Measures and Plans on the Conservation and Sustainable Utilisation of Biodiversity 2008-2012" (the earlier NBSAP), in particular with the strengthen capacity in conservation, restoration and protection of natural habitats, outside the protected areas, and to provide protection for endangered, rare and endemic species. It further supports the current NBSAP (2015-2021) which includes 4 strategies. i.e. (1) Integrate biodiversity values and management with participation at all levels (2) Conserve and restore biodiversity, (3) Protect country's rights and enable management to enhance and share benefits from biodiversity in line with green economy, and (4) Develop biodiversity knowledge and database systems to be consistent with internationally recognized standards.

In the context of change in national situation, the project has been designed to improve the sustainability of mainstreaming biodiversity by influencing the policies and investments of key government agencies responsible for land use planning, agriculture, tourism and environmental protection.

The project design has systematically screened the environmental and social risks through the UNDP Environmental and Social Screening procedure and identified the adequate mitigation measures. Similarly, in decision making process, the Local Project Committee (LPC) is to be undertaken in a fully participatory way to ensure that all stakeholders are able to present their views and no groups are marginalized or have their livelihoods unduly impacted to land use zoning and regulation development. The stakeholder's analysis was done well and the stakeholders' involvement and role in project outcome was identified clearly. However, there were no formal roles assigned with mandate to deliver outputs and outcome by these stakeholders, apart from the project implementers.

The project has included a gender mainstreaming plan/initiative which details of activities, process and timeframe for each outcome. The plan is to be monitored and evaluated at inception, and during the implementation. However, there was no gender indicator in the results framework. The ProDoc recommends that gender mainstreaming concept is introduced to all key stakeholders during the inception phase and the concept is adopted into the project planning and implementation. Indicative gender mainstreaming activities are given in the ProDoc for all outputs. UNDP is in the process of producing a story of women-led social enterprise as part of lesson learned from this project.

### **3.1.2 Results Framework/Log frame**

The MTR team undertook an analysis of the project's log frame to assess how the midterm and end-of-project targets are using the specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound framework, and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the indicators or targets, as necessary.

There is one target that is not measurable on the critical habitat of SPB converted for intensive agriculture and urban/industrial development. This target is ambiguous - no increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted; it should be measured in the form of "ha pan salt" or "mudflats

km<sup>2</sup>” or “ha of new aquaculture and development areas” between the start of the project and end of project, within the habitat in Khok Kham location.

One indicator is not possibly achievable given the time frame of the project. This is on the status of species on the National Red list. The end of target is no overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand (i.e. movement from one category to another). This is beyond the ability of the project to control the status changes, as the project is more focused on the 3 species.

All other indicators and targets are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound. The Results Framework has nine indicators for the objective, and two outcomes. As at the MTR stage, none of the targets of these indicators have been achieved.

There were three changes made at the inception. The target for ESC survival rate of reintroduced population was reduced from 70% to 60% and the target for number of ESC in “wild” population and ‘wild’ breeding increased from 25 birds to 40 birds. Currently, the ZPO is confident that the target of up to 70% is achievable. Another change was to change the name Water Lily to Water onion. One other change was proposed at inception; to reduce the baseline for spoon billed bird number from 4 to 2. However, this was not reflected in the PIR reporting. In the NSC meeting, the DNP’s Wildlife Conservation Office, commented that some of the indicators are subject to high uncertainties beyond the project’s control, especially the one on the number of the spoon-billed pipers – which may be lost along their migration pathways, even though the project could indeed conserve their habitats in the inner gulf of Thailand.

In the Project Document the Theory of Change process is missing in designing the project results framework. It is noted that there is no proper alignment between the Outcome, outputs and the indicators and targets. The four outputs under outcome 1 is logically related to the four indicators and targets proposed. But for outcome 2, the outputs description and the indicators and targets selected do not match the respective outputs clearly, although they are related. In fact Output 2.1 should be aligned to indicators and targets 1.2 and 1.3 as well as indicators and targets 2.2 and 2.3. Conversely, output 2.2 and 2.3 is more aligned to indicator and target 2.1

Table 1 provides summary of the issues related to the indicators and targets and some proposed changes.

**Table 1: Review of project indicators**

<b>Objective/ Outcome</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline Level</b>	<b>End- of- project Target</b>	<b>Issues / proposed amendment</b>
<b>Project Objective:</b> To mainstream globally important biodiversity species conservation into production sectors through improved management of critical habitats.	Hectares of production landscapes legislated as ES critical habitats and protection enforced to assure the long-term survival of ES in Thailand.	There are currently no areas of production landscape that are formally protected due to their importance to an endangered species.	At least 33,893 ha legislated as ES Critical Habitats and managed in a manner that assures the long-term survival of target ES– based on:  600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Subdistrict  4,800 ha – which includes 1 km buffer around the 3 non-hunting areas in Buriram Province	This objective level indicator is appropriate to the goal of the project that is to integrate ES protection within production landscape area. However, this can only be achieved if the provincial plan comes under the ES legislation. Neither can be completed by end of project, given the progress of the project so far.  Nevertheless, this is still possible if efforts of ONEP to complete the Environmental Protected Area designation, areas and its regulations based on “Promotion and Conservation



Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline Level	End- of- project Target	Issues / proposed amendment
			28,493 ha which is the entire Nakha Subdistrict	of National Environmental Quality Act, B.E. 2535” for Water Onion, Spoon Billed Sand Piper and Sarus crane, with Provincial Local Administrative Office,
	Status of species on the National Red list.	Thailand currently has 1,058 species identified as threatened within the country’s National Red list of which 6 are extinct.	No overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand (i.e. movement from one category to another).	This is beyond the ability of the project to control the status changes, as the project is more focused on the 3 species.  MTR team recommends that this target is changed to “no overall decline in species status of SPB, WL and ESC”.
Outcome 1: Enabling framework and capacity to manage ES in productive landscapes strengthened	Approval of ES and Critical Habitat Bill and landuse planning framework by key decision makers	No Act currently exists focused on the conservation of endangered species.	Bill approved by Cabinet	The Project Board decided that due to a transition period in Thailand political process, the Bill will not get approved by the Cabinet within the project time frame. The Project Board agreed to consider a reduction of ambitions to reach a Bill approval in the Mid Term Review. However, it’s not clear what is the proposal from the Project Board.  Although the decision above was made by the PR in 2016, it is noted that both the PIR 2018 and the Work Plan 2018-2019 submitted by the new RP, IUCN still maintained this “Bill approval” target.  The MTR team recommends the target changed to “draft Bill recommended to NEB after consultation with stakeholders”.
	Reduction in threats to ES and critical habitats from landuse change through adoption of landuse zoning for ES and critical habitat conservation within provincial Plans based on Landuse planning framework	Currently no provincial plans have ES focused landuse zoning.	At least 5 provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas	The EOP target of is almost impossible to be achieved because only 3 provinces are involved in the discussion so far and the report from TEI on the landuse plan is not completed yet. Moreover Department of Town and Country Planning’s involvement at the national level as been almost nil so far, and thus would be difficult to ensure that the department could actually complete all the 5 plans in time.  MTR team recommends the target is changed to “land use zoning for ES and critical habitat at these 5 provinces

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline Level	End- of- project Target	Issues / proposed amendment
				completed and submitted to the TCPD for inclusion in the provincial plans".
	Management and monitoring system for endangered species operational indicated by number of species for which conservation and recovery plans are in place, critical habitats are defined, management plans in place utilising GIS decision support tool and monitoring is in action.	Basic data system in place but not operational and with limited data management capacity.	Target of 10 species. (Target includes 3 pilot species and 7 additional species).	For clarification, the target is conservation and recovery plan for monitoring and management of all 10 species. Completing the data base is not the target but the plans are incorporated in the database.  The RPs (IUCN and ZPO) are capable to support this target together with ONEP which has dedicated a task officer on this.
	Improvements in capacity development indicator score for ONEP for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: Existence of operational co-management mechanisms</li> <li>• Indicator 3: Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups</li> <li>• Indicator 11: Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making mainstreaming</li> </ul>	Current capacity assessment score card notes ONEP scores as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: Score 1.</li> <li>• Indicator 3: Score 1.</li> <li>• Indicator 11: Score 1.</li> </ul>	Capacity scores increase to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: Score 3.</li> <li>• Indicator 3: Score 3.</li> <li>• Indicator 11: Score 3.</li> </ul>	This target is to achieve Output 1.4 of the project: Institutional capacity of ONEP to identify ES and monitor its recovery strengthened. However, this score card rating will be based on the ONEP's strengthened capacity in dealing with almost all other outputs of the project, as well.  There is no basis in selecting only the 3 indicators and not the rest. Indicator 5, 9, 10, are also relevant for this project's capacity strengthening of ONEP.  The Score Card Baseline was done in July 2014. In fact, the initial score for Indicator 2 was given as 2 but in the Results Framework the baseline score is given as 1. Score card typically should be done at the beginning of the project, at the mid-term and at the end of project. This exercise is not done and reported so far.  The MTR team recommends score card assessment is done immediately before the next NSC and one at the end of the project. MTR team recommends including the score for indicator 5, 9 and 10

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline Level	End- of- project Target	Issues / proposed amendment
Outcome 2: Critical Habitat management demonstrated for three Endangered Species	Number of hectares of production landscape where land owners/users have been capacitated in producing environmentally friendly products.	No areas within the target locations currently use biodiversity friendly production techniques.	600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Subdistrict have been capacitated in sustainable SBS-friendly salt production Communities engaged in salt Production  400 ha of rice fields in within 1 km of reservoirs in Buriram Province have been capacitated in organic and Eastern Sarus Crane-friendly rice	No recommendation. The stakeholders are confident that these are achievable.
	Stability or increase in numbers of populations of the following species at target sites: – Spoon-billed Sandpiper – Water lily – Eastern Sarus Crane	Spoon-billed Sandpiper – 4 at pilot location in Khok Kham  Water lily – 0.5ha (blooming area)  Eastern Sarus Crane – 25 in 'wild population' No wild breeding occurred	Spoon-Billed Sandpiper – no reduction in species number  Water Lily – 10% increase in blooming areas – 0.55ha  ESC > 40 in "wild" population and "wild" breeding taking place.	At the inception, the baseline for the number of Spoon-billed Sandpiper was recommended to be reduced from 4 to 2 to reflect the correct data at that time. But this was not changed in the PIR or the new Workplan. MTR team recommends this is done.  At the first NSC meeting, a suggestion was made to change the target for indicator from measured in terms of 'total area' to "increase in % of the plants", as the plants are scattered in various places which makes it difficult to calculate. This change was not made in the PIR or the workplan. The number of plants is also difficult to measure given the lifespan of the plants and the laborious task to do it. MTR team recommends maintaining this target given the baseline measurement of 0.5 ha.  This target of 40 was set during the inception (from originally at 25). No recommendation
	Identified threats to targeted species reduced: - Spoon-billed Sandpiper – critical habitat converted for intensive agriculture and urban/industrial Development  - Eastern Sarus Crane – deaths due to excessive pesticide or hunting  - Water Lily – Number of 'wild'	Area of possible SBS habitat that has been converted to uses incompatible for SBS use  Eastern Sarus Crane – 25 in 'wild population' (36 released 4 deceased 7 missing)  669,563 Water Lilies exported through Suvarnabhumi	No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long- term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location  ESC increases in survival rate of reintroduced population. Current survival rate 60% over a three-year period.  At end-of-project, no export recorded of 'wild' collected water lilies at the Suvarnabhumi Airport	Target is ambiguous for this indicator. It should be measured in the form of "ha pan salt" or "mudflats km2" or "ha of new aquaculture and development areas" between the start of the project and end of project, within the habitat in Khok Kham location. MTR team recommends that BCST/IUCN/ONEP to suggest this in the next NSC.  This target was reduced from 70% to 60% during the inception phase. ZPO should be able to conduct survey to measure this.  The target for this indicator seems specific and measurable. However, the illegal export through the airport can be

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline Level	End- of- project Target	Issues / proposed amendment
	collected plant specimens to exported out of Thailand	Airport during 2006 -2009 (number of 'wild' collected specimens not known)		reduced or eliminated only if enforcement on the illegal wild water lily collection is implemented, together with the awareness campaign that is on-going. Moreover, the baseline data seems to be outdated, from 2009. There should have been updated data on this from Plan Quarantine Officials.  The MTR team recommends that the baseline level use 2014/15/16 figure.

## 3.2 Progress Towards Results

### 3.2.1 Progress Towards Outcome Analysis

The progress towards outcome is assessed based on data provided in the PIRs, supplemented by data provided in the GEF TTs, the findings of the MTR mission, and interviews with the project stakeholders. Table 2 provides the summary of the progress towards the end-of-project targets for the project objective and each outcome.

The **progress towards objective**: To mainstream globally important biodiversity species conservation into production sectors through improved management of critical habitats

There are two indicators that contribute to the achievements of the objective. These are hectares of production landscapes legislated as ES critical habitats and protection enforced to assure the long-term survival of ES in Thailand and status of species on the National Red list in the list.

The first indicator has the target of at least 33,893 ha *legislated* as ES Critical Habitats and managed in a manner that assures the long-term survival of target ES– based on:

- 600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Subdistrict
- 4,800 ha – which includes 1 km buffer around the 3 non-hunting areas in Buriram Province
- 28,493 ha which is the entire Nakha Subdistrict

The study to review legislation related to ES and habitat protection was conducted but not completed in 2017. With the change of project responsible parties, IUCN is working with Thailand Environmental Institute to complete this. The community consultation regarding the legal framework in each target area will be conducted to finalize to most practical legislation for protecting endangered species and its habitats.

Across the three pilot sites, a Local Project Committee (LPC), consisting of Governor, Provincial Office of Natural Resources and Environment, Provincial Public Works and Town and County Planning Office, Provincial Local Administration Office, Provincial Tourism Authority Office, Provincial Marine Office, Provincial Administration Office, Provincial Public Relations Office, Klong Naka Wildlife Sanctuary, Provincial Forestry Office, Provincial Agricultural Extension Office, Provincial District Office and Sub-district Administration, academic institution and CSO has been formed. The LAC at the project sites are being revised based on the most updated list of government officers and other stakeholders acting as the

LAC assigned by the provincial governor. IUCN is to organise the provincial LAC meeting and updates of the legal framework for conserving endangered flora and fauna species in each target province will be discussed closely with ONEP and the provincial LAC.

In Ranong, a Provincial Governor Order was issued to prohibit dredging activity in Suksamran and Kaper Districts in order to sustain water level for the water onions. This has resulted in a significant decrease in dredging activities. The project has been working to strengthen the coordination among various key stakeholders to monitor enforcement. The Provincial Agricultural Extension Office was involved in advocacy and consultation to include water onions in the Plants Act, B.E. 2518 (1975) as protection mechanism.

In Samut Sakorn, a plan to build a solar farm by a private sector, on the coastal areas had threatened to the ES habitat protection in this pilot site unattainable. However, the plan was shelved due to the protests from the local and the civil society networks. The Ministry of Energy did not approve the solar farm project because the location did not meet the approval criteria. The project continues to monitor the situation with local stakeholders and has considered linking the pilot works to the adjacent Petchaburi Province, which is in the connected habitat landscape of the spoon-billed sand pipers, as a risk mitigation measure.

ONEP is working on the Environmental Protected Area designation, areas and its regulations based on “Promotion and Conservation of National Environmental Quality Act, B.E. 2535” for Water Onion, Spoon Billed Sand Piper and Sarus crane. The initial discussion between ONEP, IUCN, LPC and other related stakeholders on this has taken place but to date there is no hectares of production landscapes being officially legislated as ES critical habitats.

The second indicator has the target of no overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand (i.e. movement from one category to another). The National Red List for Thailand has not been reassessed since project inception. The legislative review done by the project identified that Thailand has an ad hoc policy with insufficient clear framework or implementation guideline including process of ES listing that resulted in low number of new species added to the protection list. MONRE has appointed the National Committee of Biodiversity utilization and conservation since 2000 to review species database, update and oversee the status of species in the country.

ONEP launched an updated version of “Thailand Red Data: Vertebrates” in September 2017 based on IUCN Red List. The status of these following species has been updated in the “Thailand Red Data: Vertebrates” 2017;

1. Spoon-billed Sandpiper; Critically Endangered (CR)
2. Sarus Crane; Critically Endangered (CR)
3. Fishing cat (*Prionailurus viverrinus*); Endangered (EN)
4. Eastern Grass Owl (*Tyto longimembris*); Vulnerable (VU)
5. Mekong Wegetail (*Motacilla samveasnae*); Near Threatened (NT)
6. Somphong's Rasbora (*Trigonostigma somphongsi*); Critically Endangered (CR)

However, the Water Onion, Giant Mountain Crab (*Potamon bhumibol*), Sirindhorn's Magnolia (*Magnolia Sirindhorniae*), and Endemic Zingiberaceae (*Smithatris supranea*) are not yet being assessed. Assessment of flora species will be led by DNP with the support from IUCN and ZPO.

ONEP is working on the draft of “Biodiversity Protection Act”, which all related regulations and management plan of those species will be prioritized. The draft act and other related species

management plans will be proposed to the National Sub-committee of Convention on Biological Diversity and the National Committee of Biodiversity utilization and conservation.

### **Progress towards Outcome 1: Enabling framework and capacity to manage ES in productive landscapes strengthened**

There are 4 outputs and 4 respective indicators/targets for this outcome.

Output 1.1: Legislative framework for ES conservation strengthened through development of ES and Critical Habitat Bill with target of having the Bill approved at the end of the project.

Currently there is no legislation on ES and habitats outside Protected Areas. The project's aim is to provide this protection to ES outside PAs. There is lack of activities carried out under this output with exception being the completion of a draft review of existing legal and regulatory framework to identify gaps and potential opportunities of enforcement and coordination among related agencies. The recommendations include: (1) holistic approach should be used to improve ES integral definitions that cover both animals and plants and focus more on species not just areas; (2) ES framework should clearly define ES categories, protection listing process, requirements and timeframe to ensure the protection list is regularly reviewed; (3) definitions should refer to scientific data and make accessible in simple formats for public information; (4) conservation and restoration activity can engage private sector. Human and financial supports should be increased to improve legislative enforcement.

Consultations with related agencies and stakeholders at both national and provincial level has not taken place. In addition, due to a transition period in Thailand political process, the Project Board doesn't see that the project can get the Bill approved by the Cabinet within the project time frame. The Project Board agreed to consider a reduction in the target of this output. The project PMU supposed to come up with the key recommendations to draft the Bill.

Output 1.2: Land Use Planning Framework in place that integrates conservation into land-use planning and allocation decisions, with the target of at least 5 provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas.

The output can be achieved through both national and provincial level platform and consultation. The project has not initiated any national level discussion/platform to enable changes at the policy level. However, at the provincial level the LPC initiative and the acknowledgement and awareness of the provincial offices (PONRE, DTP) and Governors, are being created by the project with initial discussion. ONEP has been in discussion with the DPT in the 3 target provinces regarding this. The communities are also aware the work of the project in this intention. The TOR for land use expert was recently finalised and consultant has been appointed by TEI. However, the land use review and recommendations report has not been finalised yet.

Output 1.3: ONEP-Led cross-sectoral coordination mechanism in place leading to better planning, coordination, monitoring and enforcement capabilities for ES conservation, with the target of 10 species (includes 3 pilot species and 7 additional species) to have conservation and recovery plan for monitoring and management of the species with the database systems in place utilising GIS decision support tool and monitoring.

This output intends to develop a monitoring and management system using a database and GIS that has the conservation and recovery plans, defined critical habitats, and management plans for 10 species (3 species under the pilots of this project) and 7 additional targeted species were identified through a technical consultation. The 7 additional identified species were identified to be: Somphong's Rasbora, Giant Mountain Crab, Eastern Grass Owl, Mekong Wagtail, Fishing Cat, Smithatris Supranenae, and Champi Sirindhorn. However, this list has yet to be confirmed with other responsible agencies. The ONEP has assigned a desk officer in charge on National Red Data and Bio Bank of the ES to work with the Project Manager (IUCN as Responsible Party) to ensure that the target 10 species will be integrated into Red Data. ZPO is taking the lead on this.

Of the 3 conservation and recovery plans for the 3 ES under the project, only the ESC's plans have been clearly worked on and nearing to completion. The activities for the plans for SBP and WO have not started yet.

Output 1.4: Institutional capacity of ONEP to identify ES and monitor its recovery strengthened, with the target at the end of the project being capacity score increase from score 1 to score 3 for three indicators of the Capacity Score Card Assessment (as part of the GEF Tracking Tool).

The project has hired an IT/GIS technical consultant to improve ES database system that can directly feed into decision making processes at national, provincial, and local levels and to develop the overall information system framework as well as conservation and recovery plan format, which provide a clear baseline for future management and conservation activities.

Data has already begun to be collected on the 10 species. ZPO's Eastern Sarus Crane Database is going on with the appointment of consultant and inception report submitted. This work will include Phase-I with the planning, cooperation and literature review of primary and secondary data, Phase-II is the surveying physiological, biological, chemicals and threats of wetlands included of economic and socialization of local communities, and Phase-III is the integrated data processing and makes the RAMSAR information Sheet (RIS) including of GIS-based land suitability analysis.

Database and collection of data for SBP and WO has not started yet, thus this output is behind target and has not yet been fully implemented.

The ONEP capacity building target is also behind schedule as the capacity score card has not been updated since the beginning of the project. It is noted that this score card rating will be based on the ONEP's strengthened capacity in dealing with almost all other outputs of the project, as well.

### **Progress towards Outcome 2 : Critical Habitat management demonstrated for three Endangered Species**

There are 3 outputs and 3 respective indicators/targets for this outcome.

Output 2.1: Management and zoning plans implemented of the identified critical habitats for Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Water Lily, and Eastern Sarus Crane in Burirum, Samut Sakorn, and Ranong Provinces, with the end of the project targets being relevant to Indicators 2.2 to achieve stability or increase in number of populations of the 3 species at target sites and Indicator 2.3, to reduce the identified threats to the targets species.

## ESC

Tracking survey and mapping of reintroduced ESC has been regularly conducted to monitor ESC population, behaviours, and movement. In 2017, there are 9 wild breeding nests, an increase from 3 nests in 2016 (3 in Huay Chorakaemak, Muang, 5 in Prakonchai and 1 in Baan Dan. Capacity building training on ESC tracking survey and wetlands assessment was provided for DNP officials from Huay Chorakaemak, Huay Talat and Sanambin Non-Hunting Areas. This included, increased knowledge and skills on comparing and evaluating methods of captive breeding and post-release monitoring has strengthened ESC monitoring system. Education and awareness-raising materials on piloted ES and critical habitat were developed and disseminated to enhance understanding conservation and threats to ES and critical habitats among key stakeholders including youth and the public. ESC conservation youth camp was conducted for local youth to raise awareness and build capacity on importance of wetlands, ESC conservation and environment in Burirum. A youth network was established and are equipped with knowledge and skills to be local volunteers engaging in ESC conservation and transfer knowledge to their families and friends. An organic rice manufacturer group was established with currently 29 pilot members. ZPO provided supports on setting up guidelines and documentation for registration with Community Organizations Development Institute (Public Organization): CODI, under the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security. The project recorded that the survival rate of released Eastern Sarus Cranes remains at 60%. ZPO suggested that the rate of up to 70% can be achieved

## SBP

Biological data collection and threats to SBS and critical habitat in Khok Kham, Samut Sakorn Province; and Pak Thale, Laem Pak Bia, Petchburi Province was conducted by BCST who is joining the project as an Implementing Partner responsible for socio-economic and ecological assessments of the SBS. and the latest monitoring reported 2 sightings in Khok Kham which is a decrease from the baseline.

No further progress in awareness raising and critical habitat has been reported for the Water Onion and SBP but with the IUCN contracted as the RPA for the two species, the workplan has detailed activities in the coming quarters.

The field trip study on best practice of conservation scheme, land use management, and case study of ES and critical habitat conservation from other countries has been discussed with ONEP for the potential sites as well as the list of participants.

Output 2.2: Long-term financial sustainability strategy for 3 ES sites developed and Output 2.3: Strengthening of Extension support to help guide land users to adopt biodiversity friendly land-use practice, with the relevant indicators and targets being a) 600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Subdistrict have been capacitated in sustainable SBS-friendly salt production Communities engaged in salt production, and b) 400 ha of rice fields in within 1 km of



reservoirs in Buriram Province have been capacitated in organic and Eastern Sarus Crane-friendly rice.

Training and equipment support for sea salt soap-making was provided for local salt product groups in Kok Kham Sub-district in Samut Sakorn. Exchange visit in Bang Kla District, Chachengsao Province and Klong Tamrhu Sub-district, Muang District, Chonburi Province was conducted for CSO and community members from Khok Kham Sub-district, Samut Sakorn. Discussions and knowledge sharing during the visit enhanced capacities and networking on environmental-friendly practices, community products and ES and habitat management in community level. Increased knowledge and experiences will contribute to community conservation management and the implementation plan that promotes environmental-friendly salt products.

A training curriculum was developed on organic rice production for communities surrounding the wetlands of Huay Chorakaemak and Huay Talat Non-Hunting Areas in Buriram. The curriculum covers 3 topics of sustainable development and public participation in wetlands and the Eastern Sarus Cranes (ESC) conservation, organic rice production techniques and organic rice standards and certified food safety. Trainings on organic rice and Wetland and ESC Conservation were conducted for community members in Ban Bua Sub-district in Huay Chorakaemak Non-Hunting Area. Capacity buildings and supports on product quality, branding, packaging and marketing for Sarus Rice were also provided to promote ESC-friendly rice products. Organic rice database in Huay Chorakaemak Non-Hunting was also developed and will link to the central ES database.

In Buriram province, the survey to develop a household database for the Sanambin Reservoir area in order to create a prototype community of Eastern Sarus Crane conservation in the area was done. Partnership with private sector was done through MC GROUP Public Company Limited which made an agreement to order 15,000 kilograms of Sarus Rice from the Baan Sawaiso Community Enterprise Group. This group is a prototype community for Eastern Sarus Crane conservation.

The project is in the midst of negotiations with CP All Public Company Limited to have 280 farmers from the 3 villages around Huay Chorakaemak reservoir join in the project of jasmine rice production. This project's objective is to extend agriculture and CP will agree to buy all products produced by these farmers. The project is also meeting with the Buriram Sugar Group and Buriram Irrigation Project about the approval request of the site for building the Eastern Sarus Crane and Wetland Learning Center and the guidelines of area

Capacity building for the target communities in Samut Sakon and Ranong has not yet taken place for both the Water Onion and Spoon-billed Sandpiper aspects of this project.

**Table 2: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-Project Targets)**

Project Strategy	Indicator	End- of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievements ratings	Justification for Rating
<b>Project Objective:</b> To mainstream globally important biodiversity species conservation into production sectors through improved management of critical habitats.	1. Hectares of production landscapes legislated as ES critical habitats and protection enforced to assure the long-term survival of ES in Thailand.	At least 33,893 ha legislated as ES Critical Habitats and managed in a manner that assures the long-term survival of target ES–based on:  600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Subdistrict  4,800 ha – which includes 1 km buffer around the 3 non-hunting areas in Buriram Province  28,493 ha which is the entire Nakha Subdistrict		Moderately Unsatisfactory	The ES legislation is not ready and progress towards it has been very slow. It is the view of most of the stakeholders that approved legislation will take a longer time and could be beyond the timeframe of the project.  The targeted provincial plans for the integration of the ES critical habitat has not taken place. There is discussion on this but only at two of the three sites. At the national level no discussion or dialogue or awareness taking place.  Identification of these areas and some form of socialization of their importance is taking place especially at the community level.
	2. Status of species on the National Red list	No overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand (i.e. movement from one category to another).			The status of these following species has been updated in the “Thailand Red Data: Vertebrates” 2017; 1.Spoon-billed Sandpiper; Critically Endangered (CR) 2.Sarus Crane; Critically Endangered (CR) 3.Fishing cat ( <i>Prionailurus viverrinus</i> ); Endangered (EN) 4.Eastern Grass Owl ( <i>Tyto longimembris</i> ); Vulnerable (VU) 5.Mekong Wegtail ( <i>Motacilla samveasnae</i> ); Near Threatened (NT) 6.Somphong's Rasbora ( <i>Trigonostigma somphongsi</i> ); Critically Endangered (CR).  The status of Water Onion, Giant Mountain Crab ( <i>Potamon bhumibol</i> ), Sirindhorn's Magnolia ( <i>Magnolia Sirindhorniae</i> ), and Endemic Zingiberaceae ( <i>Smithatris supraneanae</i> ) are not yet being assessed.

Project Strategy	Indicator	End- of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievements ratings	Justification for Rating
<b>Outcome 1</b> Enabling framework and capacity to manage ES in productive landscapes strengthened	3. Approval of ES and Critical Habitat Bill and landuse planning framework by key decision makers	Bill approved by Cabinet		Moderately Unsatisfactory	Draft Bill is not reviewed and consulted yet. At the midterm, the Bill should have been reviewed and consulted so that the remaining issues can be brought to an interagency discussion at the national level for more discussion and decision. There were some concerns about the end of project target during inception, but this was not followed through by NSC.
	4. Reduction in threats to ES and critical habitats from landuse change through adoption of landuse zoning for ES and critical habitat conservation within provincial Plans based on Landuse planning framework	At least 5 provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas			Socialization of this is being done at only 3 out of the 5 provinces so far. This is primarily with the provincial administration.  Many aspects of this target are not in place yet. These include assessment of land use, database of ES, identification of critical habitat areas, community's feedback, private sector's engagement and revision of local regulations.
	5. Management and monitoring system for endangered species operational indicated by number of species for which conservation and recovery plans are in place, critical habitats are defined, management plans in place utilising GIS decision support tool and monitoring is in action	Target of 10 species. (Target includes 3 pilot species and 7 additional species).			ES management plans are being developed and the initial survey and other assessments are on-going now. In this aspect, efforts for ESC is more advanced than for SBP and WO.  Seven additional targeted species were identified through a technical consultation to include in the management and monitoring system for endangered species  Database for ESC has already begun to be collected.

Project Strategy	Indicator	End- of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievements ratings	Justification for Rating
	<p>6. Improvements in capacity development indicator score for ONEP for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicator 2: Existence of operational co-management mechanisms</li> <li>Indicator 3 Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups</li> <li>Indicator 11: Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making mainstreaming</li> </ul>	<p>Capacity scores increase to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicator 2: Score 3.</li> <li>Indicator 3: Score 3.</li> <li>Indicator 11: Score 3.</li> </ul>			<p>No Capacity Score Card record is done at the mid-term.</p> <p>The evidence is not available that through this project, the ONEP's capacity is strengthened in operational co-management mechanism and cooperation with stakeholders. Similarly, the adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making mainstreaming is also not clear, ZPO has already started work on the database.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2</b> Critical Habitat management demonstrated for three Endangered Species</p>	<p>7. Number of hectares of production landscape where land owners/users have been capacitated in producing environmentally friendly products.</p>	<p>600 ha of salt pans in Khok Kham Subdistrict have been capacitated in sustainable SBS-friendly salt production</p> <p>Communities engaged in salt Production</p> <p>400 ha of rice fields in within 1 km of reservoirs in Buriram Province have been capacitated in organic and</p>		<p>Moderately Unsatisfactory</p>	<p>Exchange visit in Bang Kla District, Chachengsao Province and Klong Tamrhu Sub-district, Muang District, Chonburi Province was conducted for CSO and community members from Khok Kham Sub-district, Samut Sakorn to learn on environmental-friendly practices, community products and ES and habitat management in community level. Training and equipment support for sea salt soap-making was provided for local salt product groups in Kok Kham Sub-district in Samut Sakorn</p> <p>MC GROUP Public Company Limited made an agreement to order 15,000 kilograms of Sarus Rice from the Baan Sawaiso Community Enterprise Group. A training curriculum was developed on organic rice production for communities surrounding the wetlands of Huay</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator	End- of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievements ratings	Justification for Rating
		Eastern Sarus Crane-friendly rice			<p>Chorakaemak and Huay Talat Non-Hunting Areas in Burirum</p> <p>Capacity building for the target communities in Samut Sakon and Ranong not done yet.</p> <p>No certification yet. BEDO's involvement is not evident.</p>
	8. Stability or increase in numbers of populations of the following species at target sites: – Spoon-billed Sandpiper – Water lily – Eastern Sarus Crane	<p>Spoon-Billed Sandpiper – no reduction in species number</p> <p>Water Lily – 10% increase in blooming areas – 0.55ha</p> <p>ESC &gt; 40 in 'wild' population and 'wild' breeding taking place.</p>			<p>No assessment/survey for SBP and Water Lily conducted at mid-term review.</p> <p>The latest monitoring reported 2 sightings in Khok Kham.</p> <p>General consensus from the community is that Water Lily quantity and area have increased especially with community's regeneration activity for tourism purpose.</p> <p>Tracking survey and mapping were conducted for ESC and latest as of Q2/2018, 52 of the 86 reintroduced cranes survived after release.</p>
		<p>No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location</p> <p>ESC increase in survival rate of reintroduced population. Current survival rate 60% over a three year period.</p> <p>At end-of-project, no export recorded of 'wild' collected water lilies at the</p>			<p>No data reported on the area of critical SBS habitat although monitoring of the SBS habitat has already been conducted by the Bird Conservation Society of Thailand. This data will be made available to the project by December 2018.</p> <p>Between January and March 2018, there were 346 visitors to the. Awareness through Eastern Sarus Crane Conservation Center in Huai Sang Nhur, Buriram Province Awareness for local community on potential threats they pose to the Eastern Sarus Cranes. Organic rice farming being promoted in order to prevent pesticide-related Eastern Sarus Crane deaths. From 2011-2018, the survival rate of released Eastern Sarus Cranes remains at 60%.</p> <p>No record or data on wild collected water lilies for illegal export available nor any activities leading toward it.</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator	End- of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievements ratings	Justification for Rating
		Suvarnabhumi Airport			

Green= Achieved

Yellow= On target to be achieved

Red= Not on target to be achieved

### 3.2.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

It is difficult to identify or measure whether the barriers and threats identified in the Project Document are reduced or overcome. This is because most of the activities have not implemented due to lack of project management oversight arising from the ineffectiveness of the previous PMU and delay in the appointment of the new PMU. The other implementation challenges are the lack of interagency coordination between line agencies and the almost non operation of the LPCs at the project sites. The main challenge is for IUCN and ZPO to coordinate internally with ONEP and start delivering the activities identified in the revised workplan 2018-2019.

Another major challenge for the project is that although eco-tourism is identified as the tools/means to achieve some of the intended goals, there are no efforts to leverage the tourism industry – government depart, private tour operators, and experts, effectively in strengthening/securing the species habitat.

Demonstrating the interagency coordination in decision making and managing the ES habitat is also a big challenge for the project in the remaining period of the project.

### 3.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

#### 3.3.1 Management Arrangements

The project had a smooth beginning with the inception workshop completed in December 2015 after the project document was signed in September 2015.

The project is executed through UNDP’s National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) as the Implementing Partner (IP) and the Zoological Park Organisation (ZPO) as the Responsible Party (RP). In addition, after April 2018, IUCN also became the RP.

ONEP is responsible for the disbursement of funds and the achievement of the project objective and outcomes, according to the approved work plan. In particular, ONEP, as the Implementing Partner (IP), is responsible for coordinating project activities and certifying expenditures in line with approved budgets and work-plans.

IUCN is responsible for the overall project management unit as well as Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 related to SBP and WO. ZPO is responsible to lead the implementation of the Eastern Sarus Crane Cluster.

The UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) is responsible for providing financial and audit services, recruitment of project staff and contracting of consultants and service providers, and overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by PB. A UNDP staff member is assigned with the responsibility for the day-to-day oversight and control over project deliveries

The Project Board (PB) is chaired by ONEP, under MONRE and serve as the project's governance and decision-making body. The PB, comprise representatives of ONEP, ZPO, IUCN, UNDP and relevant agencies within MONRE – including the Royal Forestry Department (RFD), Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plants Conservation (DNP), and Department of Marine and Coastal Resources (DMCR). Ministry of Interior (MoI) is represented by Department of Land Admiration. The other members are Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MoAC) and Ministry of Tourism and Sports (MoTS). At the moment there are no representatives of civil society and the private sector in the PB although there is provision for that.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) was set up to provide the day-to-day coordination and administration of the project. It originally comprised of the Project Manager (PM) and the Project Assistant (PA). The PM is accountable to the PB for the overall quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the activities carried out, as well as for the use of funds. The PM will collate the input from the key Implementation Partners and produce Annual Work and Budget Plans to be approved by the PB at the beginning of each year. These plans will provide the basis for allocating resources to planned activities. Currently, the PMU is made up of 2 staff from IUCN since the resignation of the earlier PM. The PMU is also coordinating activities at both national and provincial level with relevant stakeholders and consultants.

The MTR team noted that the Project Manager was ineffective in carrying out the tasks of the PMU, as evidenced from the PIR comments by ONEP. With the resignation of the original PM in March 2017, there was an attempt to recruit a new PM, initially. But this was not successful. It was then that a new plan to appoint another RP to do the overall management of the project and to deliver part of the outcomes. This process took some time to materialise and hence caused further delay in project implementation. This role is now filled by IUCN. In addition, there were delays in signing the Responsible Party Agreement by IUCN arising from its internal management restructuring, although this has now been resolved. This did, however, cause subsequent delays in project implementation and limited progress towards meeting annual disbursement targets. The new work plan has already been approved by the project board meeting in May 2018 but the new RP, IUCN could not start the work until the contract been signed in August 2018. Due to this, most of the activities in part of 2017 and almost the entire 2018 were not carried. This has led to the delay in the mid-term review and has to be rescheduled towards late 2018, after activities of the new Responsible Party have commenced.

The gap in the project management structure had led to also delay in the commencement of activities at both national levels primarily involving Outcome 1 and at the provincial level involving mainly Outcome 2. The Local Project Committees' processes, including the finalisation of members, meetings, and awareness activities were also delayed. It is noted that changes in the management at ONEP and UNDP also compounded the delay in making necessary adaptive management decisions and operational of the original workplan. Some of the ONEP staff including the Project Director has been transferred to another job and a new Project Director was appointed. This has not decreased the ownership or reporting of the project progress but rather could have reduced the focus on the project given the time taken

to familiarise with the situation of the project and also other on-going commitments for the new person. Similarly, at UNDP, almost the entire original programme team that designed the project is no longer in UNDP. The MTR team noted that the ownership and reporting at both ONEP and UNDP was not compromised by this but the adequacy of management inputs and processes to monitor risk and quickly provide decisions for adaptive management were obviously affected.

### **3.3.2 Work planning**

ONEP and UNDP signed the project document on 22 September 2015. A project manager was recruited in November 2015 and the inception workshop was held on 1 December 2015. ONEP approved the establishment and membership of the project board in January 2016.

Three project board meetings took place as follows:

- The first project board meeting was held in June 2016.
- The second project board meeting was held in March 2017.
- The third project board was held in May 2018.

The following provincial project steering committees were established as follows:

- Provincial project steering committee of Samut Sakhon Provincial Authority was established in June 2016.
- Provincial project steering committee of Ranong Provincial Authority was established in April 2016.
- Provincial project steering committee of Buriram Provincial Authority was held in May 2016.

The project started off well with the inception held immediately after the project signing. However, in spite of the early recruitment of a Project Manager and the appointment of ZPO as RP, the activities implemented in 2016 has been limited to

- Establishment of Provincial Project Committee
- Training and study visits
- Procurement of equipment to monitor sarus cranes
- Awareness raising activities among youth groups and local communities

In early 2017, after the resignation of the Project Manager, activities of the project were severely delayed with exception to the activities under ZPO. There was a gap of nearly 12 months before another RP was appointed to take over the overall management of the project (to replace the PMU) and responsible for Outcome 1 (taking over from ONEP) and some parts of Outcome 2. IUCN as the new additional RP, completed the Workplan for 2018- and 2019 in May 2018 but did not get to implement activities until September 2018 due its own internal reorganisation exercise.

The 2018-2019 Workplan was developed by IUCN based on the project strategy and results framework of the original project document. The workplan is of high quality and details activities for each quarter of 2018 and 2019. The workplan was prepared in consultation with UNDP, ONEP and ZPO. However, it has not been discussed with local project committees as well as the other related agencies and stakeholders. It was presented to the Project Board for approval in May 2018.



### **3.3.3 Finance and co-finance**

The financial planning, control and disbursement are done effectively and in accordance to the UNDP internal control mechanism. There are no payment issues for project deliverables. Although, audit for the project has not be done, other due diligence is in place. These include the spot check report on ZPO, IUCN and micro assessment report as per the HACT frameworks.

Since all disbursements was done through Direct Payment modality, there were no aging issues in the beginning. Currently, the cash advance modality is being implemented with IUCN.

It is assumed that some budget revision was also done for year 2018 and 2019 given that the new workplan was presented in May 2018 for year 2018 and 2019.

The delivery rate of the project as of December 2018 is 47% (USD826,835.18) of the total project budget (USD1,758,904. These expenses are from 2015 to December 2018. The project should try to deliver the rest of the fund by September 2019.

The project did not keep record on the co-financing that has been realised from the project implementation. The total co-financing reported in the project document is USD11,137,233, consisting of:

- UNDP Cash 40,000
- ONEP – Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment In-kind 6,997,233
- ZPO – Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment In-kind 4,000,000
- Thailand Wetland Foundation In-kind 100,000

It is noted from PIR and Quarterly reports that some of the activities for the project done by ONEP, ZPO, and TEI has some form of co-financing elements. Unfortunately, these were not captured in systematic manner.

### **3.3.4 Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan and budget were adequately done in the project document. Accordingly, the quarterly, and annually monitoring are done appropriately. The quality of the quarterly report is good with detail information given for specific output and indicators.

As part of the HACT (Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer) requirement, Micro Assessment of IUCN and ZPO as RPs, was done with the project being assessed as 'Low Risk.' Quarterly Reports were prepared regularly with a standard format by RPs and the project had done two PIRs so far. UNDP CO field visits and monitoring reports are also available. However, no field mission has been conducted by RTA so far. External audit has not been carried out yet for the project. The project did not do a project inception report although there is the record of the minutes of the inception workshop. Meetings of an inception workshop plus results framework changes can fulfil the requirement for an inception report.

The GEF Tracking Tool – Capacity Score Card, was not completed at the midterm of the project. Although, this is not a formal mandatory GEF TT, for this project the Capacity

Assessment Score Card is needed in order measure and monitor the achievement of target for Indicator 4 of Outcome 1.

### **3.3.5 Stakeholder engagement**

The project management is very inclusive with the participation of UNDP, IUCN, ZPO and ONEP. These are direct and tangential stakeholders whose mandate and objectives are at the core of this project objective and outcomes. As such the engagement of these stakeholders are strong. Perhaps what is lacking is the regular communications and feedbacks on issues and decision making for adaptive management.

The participation of national level government stakeholders to ensure country-driven processes is also strong given the deliberations of the PB meetings and the inception report. However, the responsibilities assigned to these stakeholders don't seem to be specific and precise like for example heading a TWG for the project.

Participation and public awareness of the larger stakeholder are evident although not as much as required to deliver the outcome at the end of the project. Communities involvement are strong in awareness and dialogue and some specific livelihood activities of the project, such as the ESC friendly rice production communities. Youth groups involvement is also very strong in the ESC sites.

The private sector involvement can be considered good, again in the ESC sites in the form of awareness as well as purchase of ESC friendly rice. These include True Corporation Public Company, Thai AirAsia, and MC GROUP Public Company Limited. In the SBP and WO sites, there has not been such opportunity yet.

The engagement of provincial authorities is evident albeit limited actions so far. There is indication that they are aware and supportive of the project activities. There is no indication of any stakeholders being not cooperative and hence creating challenges for the implementation of the project activities.

It was not clear, however, to what extent project planning and implementation gives specific gender considerations. Minutes of Inception Workshop did not mention special session on gender mainstreaming introduction. Reports on Outputs under Outcome 1 did not provide gender disaggregated data in terms of (i) potential different impacts of legislative framework on ES Conservation and land-use planning across genders (ii) levels of female participation within decision making process of ONEP-led cross-sectoral coordination mechanism, and (iii) benefits that female and male participants benefit from capacity building process within ONEP.

Outcome 2 is obviously different. There was a clear evidence of active women's engagement in activities in the three pilot sites both in decision making and operational roles. In Ranong, women take a leadership in community's saving groups which provide financial loan to conservation and eco-tourism groups. They also participate in specific tasks to manage community-based tourism where water onion is the promoted as tourism attraction. Out of 9 village committee, 5 are women. In Samut Sakhon, special considerations are given to support income generation activities led by women, particularly those adding value to salt-farms which are habitats of Spoon-Billed Sandpiper. The project has chosen to further strengthen capacity of women's group to improve their existing salt-based activities and products such as salt-spa, salt-based soap, scrub, toothpaste, etc. to meet higher standards. The group was initially supported by the Community Development Department under its "OTOP tourism village"

scheme. In Burirum, the project supports a group of 37 rice farmers to produce and market organic 'Sarus Rice' with a story associated to Eastern Sarus Cranes which have been released in the areas, and some have nestled in the organic rice fields. Women play a leading role in QC and marketing of the Sarus Rice and other local weaving products. At the village school, Easter Sarus Crane Learning Center has been established and a female teacher and girls students take a lead in the management and operation of the Center.

### **3.3.6 Reporting**

The internal reporting like quarterly reports, and NSC minutes are done accordingly. Some of the changes done by the project have been discussed at the inception, and PB for changes. However, it is not clear if these changes were communicated to LPC. External reporting like PIRs and inception phase decision has been done. As mentioned before, Inception Report is missing though the minutes of the inception meeting was compiled. Similarly, minutes of PMU meetings which are important as a record of adaptive actions taken and the responsible parties, are not properly kept. The role of GEF OFP is crucial in monitoring the follow up actions based on the assessment in PIR. The overall lessons learned from the other past and on-going GEF projects need to be reported and shared between the implementing agencies and national project directors. Financial reporting is done adequately and in timely manner by RPs and by UNDP.

### **3.3.7 Communications**

At the design phase, a communication plan was not incorporated and budgeted.

#### **Internal project communications**

The PM is responsible for day-to-day management of the activities according to the approved workplan. Project Director assigned by ONEP has a role to approve the implementation. PMU is located in ONEP to ensure close and timely collaboration between the Project Director and Project Manager hired by UNDP. Despite this arrangement, approval and implementation of planned activities in the first and a half year of the project was much delayed and limited progress had been made. This was partly claimed to be caused by ineffective internal communications. The situation has been improved when IUCN was recruited to take up project management role in 2017 to replace the first PM who has resigned. The new PM from IUCN spends three days a week sitting in ONEP's office and working closely with ONEP project team with support from UNDP as needed.

Communication from central office to the three project sites is mainly via project field coordinators. In Ranong and Samut Sakhon, there was a communication gap for several months after the previous PM and field coordinators left until IUCN was recruited in mid-2017. In Burirum, the situation is better because ZPO is constantly communicated among its staff at both central and field levels.

#### **External Communications**

External communications have been ad-hoc although there are plans to develop regular communication channels. The project was officially launched in Ranong in November 2017 and Samut Sakhon in February 2018 which was quite late. Project Provincial Committee members, local stakeholders, schools and educational institutions, and media were invited, and the project-related materials were distributed.

Project website development is work in progress.

External communications in Burirum have been more intensive as ZPO has its presence in the province for many years. Its research team has been promoting Eastern Sarus Conservation together with other key partners including Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, private sector (Mitphol Sugar Factory), and the Provincial Governor. There are regular communication channels among these network members through Youtube, Facebook, and Line.

Annual Youth Camp to Protect Wetland and Eastern Sarus Cranes is conducted for students from local schools with action-based learning activities. After the camp, ZPO staff and project field coordinator conduct follow up visits to each individual school to support their further learning and promotional activities.

Through advocacy activities of the Eastern Sarus Crane Conservation Learning Center at Bann Nongmakhua School, Eastern Sarus Crane is adopted as Mascot for the Student Skills Competition Event for schools in northern provinces, held in Burirum in November 2018.

### **3.4 Sustainability**

The assessment of sustainability at the midterm considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes and the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The risk assessment in environmental, institutional and financial factors was done at the design stage. There is no major critical risk identified in the PIRs as well.

#### **3.4.1 Financial risks to sustainability**

All the outcomes of the project like the ES management plan (conservation and recovery plan) and the ES database need continued funding support. Budget from national budget is uncertain unless the ES legislation is up and running where budget request can be made by ONEP under its operational and development budget. At the moment there are no certainty if government budget will be available to carry out these efforts. In addition, since this is a mainstreaming project, there are no certainty yet if the agencies and stake doers responsible for the relevant production landscape sector like tourism, agriculture, and planning/works will make planning for budget to ensure their commitments for the continued support to the outcome of the project.

ONEP will presumably make the planning for additional budget as part of the exit strategy of the project. At the project sites, there are some indications that the local communities, private sector and provincial government are interested in providing funding support through various means like sponsorship, provincial budget and community funds. The RPs, as their core work involves protection of ES, is likely to raise funding for the sustainability of the outcomes of the project.

In additional, since part of the project outcome involves creating sustainable livelihood for the community through environmentally friendly products like eco-tourism and organic rice, some form of financial sustainability can be assured at the project sites.

### **3.4.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability**

Socio-economic risk relates to the social or political risks and the level of stakeholder ownership risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes. The ownership by the RPs is very high given their core work involving ES. The local communities are well organised and show clear support for all three ES at the site level. However, their concern is if the project deliverables are not implemented in timely manner and the clear protection of the ES is not done legally and in land use planning. The economic interest in changing the ES habitat from current use to ES unfriendly land use is not favoured by the local communities. The project intention of creating income generating initiatives will generate revenue to secure the support of the communities.

The political risk as identified in the project document remains low rating and moderate in likelihood. The role of NEB in pushing for the ES legislation is crucial.

### **3.4.3 Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability**

The Institutional and governance risks to sustainability can be considered low for this project since there is high level of commitment of environmental protection in general in the national development goals including the framework of Thailand's 20-Year Visionary Plan. However, the project outcome in the form of the ES legislation implemented and ES management plan are precisely the kind of policies and institutional frameworks that the project wants to create to minimise the risk to the sustainability of the ES in Thailand. Still, at the moment the role and responsibilities of government agencies are clear in ES management under protected area and production landscape. Moreover, there is indication of local support from provincial government. The RPs were already doing work on ES, in terms of developing awareness, building capacity and information, especially on ESC and SBP prior to the project.

### **3.4.4 Environmental risks to sustainability**

The climate change risk with identified as low rating and moderate likelihood in the project document. There are no major natural disaster or changes recorded in the project document and likewise none identified in the PIRs. The landscape areas of the three sites of the project are situated in different parts of the country but do not face major environmental risk. The ES management plan that will be integrated within the three provincial plans will presumably incorporate the climate change adaptation measures.

## **4. Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **4.1 Conclusions**

The MTR conclusions are based on the evidence gathered and connected to the MTR's findings. The conclusions highlight the strengths, issues and the ratings of the results/achievements of the project. Table 3 provides the MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary of the project.

Project design

As mentioned earlier, the project is highly relevant to the development plans of Thailand and specially to the environmental plans like NBSAP. The nations capacity to plan and implement

such a project on ES conservation is high given the high technical knowledge of the ES issues among the major stakeholders and project proponents. The innovative approach to integrate the biodiversity (ES) management into production landscape planning and activities is highly commendable. Although this may not be a flagship project for the Implementing Agency, nevertheless the commitment from within ONEP and other partners like ZPO, IUCN and TEI is very high.

Two major issues at the design stage; one relates to the construction of the results framework that did not follow a proper Theory of Change analysis and the other relates to the lack of responsibilities given to relevant stakeholders. The results framework has some ambiguous indicators and some mismatch between the output and indicators/targets. For a mainstreaming project like this one, specific TWG was not set up under the responsibilities of these production landscape related agencies like tourism, agriculture and planning to enable more tangible mandate and input toward the achievements of the outcome. As such the participation of TCP, Tourism Authority and Agriculture department is merely reaction to the PB meetings and activities rather than proactively owning a sub-outcome under the project.

### **Project implementation**

Project commencement was as soon as the project document signed and the management structure of PB and PMU was set up early. However, it is noted that there were some communications lapse between the PMU, ONEP and UNDP which resulted in slow progress of the activities. The project implementation was severely delayed due to the non-operation of the project management unit for nearly 18 months since the departure of the previous Project Manager. The project has done well in terms of adaptive management decision to create another RP with IUCN as project manager as well as responsible part for outcome 1 and part of outcome 2 delivery. It's unfortunate, that there was further delay in the commencement of IUCN's work as RP due to internal management changes. Consequently, the delivery of the project is low.

There seems to be lack of importance given to the recording and reporting of the co-financing, which is a crucial information for GEF as well as to Thailand's show of commitment to global biodiversity benefits contribution.

PB meetings are done one a year. This is not adequate. Similarly, the LAC has not or is not meeting often enough.

#### **Progress towards outcome**

The technical knowledge of RPs in ES management is good given their prior involvement in the awareness and conservation efforts for certain ES nationally and internationally before this project started. Other technical capacity using national consultant is not a major issue for this project.

Interagency coordination may be not working at optimal level for this project at the moment. Reliance on PB meetings to discuss and solve issues between agencies is good but not optimum. There is no frequent technical interaction in the form of technical committee between these agencies prior to the PB meetings.

The new work plan is drafted well, and the activities planned can be carried out by the RPs with the support from ONEP and other agencies. However, it looks too much for the limited remaining period of the project (September 2019). Rapid implementation of activities is needed for both SBP and WO sites as currently delivery and targets are very behind schedule.

The marginally unsatisfactory ratings for both development and implementation objectives are appropriate for the project because of the issues mentioned above.

### Sustainability

The sustainability risk is moderate because at least some outcomes will be sustained. This is due to the progress so far as well as the financing and development planning and commitment of government agencies and other NGO networks in Thailand regarding the ES conservation.

There are no major obstacles or barriers when it comes to the stakeholders' cooperation or input for the project to progress and achieve the outcomes. There are many commitments at the provincial level and at the national level to continue to provide budgets and financial support to ES in future. The only risk that can be considered critical is the socio-economic risk of communities and business interest in Samut Sakhon. If urgent intervention of the project is not institutionalized, there could be possible drastic changes to the ES habitat there.

The general conclusion that can be made is that the project's relevance, commitment and capacity of the project responsible parties, and sustainability is high given the evidence in the reports and the stakeholders consultation. The improvement needed in activities implementation and communications between parties.

**Table 3: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the Conserving habitats for globally important flora and fauna in production landscapes project**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective: To mainstream globally important biodiversity species conservation into production sectors through improved management of critical habitats.  Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Two indicators are used to measure the impact of the objective. Both cannot be measured as there are no sufficient project activities that could produce the outputs in the results framework. As such the development objective and implementation progress is lacking.  In terms of stakeholder's participation and inputs to the project objective, there are the indication that if project implementation according to the revised work plan by IUCN is done in timely manner, project objective, with some modification can be achieved.  At this point, it is difficult to measure if the threats and barriers to achieve the objective are still persistent or not.
	Outcome 1: Enabling framework and capacity to manage ES in productive landscapes strengthened Strengthening on-ground conservation actions and wildlife protection  Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There are 4 indicators of achievement for this outcome. These are related to: 5. the ES Bill, 6. species management plans, 7. ES integrated provincial plans, and 8. ONEP's capacity.  The study to review legislation related to ES and habitat protection as reported at 30 June 2017 has been conducted but is not 100% complete due to the change of project responsible parties. Draft Bill is not ready yet.  While some activities are done for 2 and 3, especially through ZPO and ONEP, there are no activities to support 1 and 4 effectively.
	Outcome 2: Critical Habitat management	There are 2 indicators of achievement for this outcome. These are related to:

	demonstrated for three Endangered Species  Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	<p>3. Area of production landscape that integrate environmental friendly production, and</p> <p>4. Stability of the species population.</p> <p>Awareness, technology/methods of production, and marketing opportunities are being identified and implemented. Partially due to the similar engagement done in the past by other projects and party due to efforts taken in Buriram.</p> <p>Eco-tourism opportunity is clearly identified but not being effectively supported by BEDO and Tourism authorities. A lot of work needed for tourism activities strengthening.</p>
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	<p>The project has experienced significant delays due to the gap in the project management capacity as there was no PM for nearly one year. The delivery in terms of expenditures is low. The adaptive management by the project to appoint a new RP to assume the overall project management and to deliver the outcomes is commendable but was done significantly late. The timing of the appointment of the new RP was delayed due to various factors including initial call for proposal did not result in any suitable candidate, and the delay in contracting IUCN.</p> <p>The project did not monitor tracking tools, co-financing and communication mechanisms.</p> <p>LPC is not operating effectively yet.</p> <p>There are improvements needed for all seven components of this measure; management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	Moderately Likely (ML)	<p>Assessment of sustainability at the midterm considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes.</p> <p>There are no major obstacles or barriers when it comes to the stakeholders' cooperation or input for the project to progress and achieve the outcomes.</p> <p>There are many commitments at the provincial level and at the national level to continue to provide budgets and financial support to ES in future.</p> <p>The only risk that can be considered critical is the socio-economic risk of communities and business interest in Samut Sakhon. If urgent intervention of the project is not institutionalized, there could be drastic changes to the ES habitat there.</p>

## 4.2 Recommendations

The MTR recommendations are presented in Table 5.

**Table 4: Recommendation Table**

Category		Recommendation	Responsible Party	Time frame
Results Framework	1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise indicator/baseline/targets</li> <li>Target for indicator 2 of the project objective is changed to "no overall decline in species status of SPB, WL and ESC" from</li> </ul>	PMU and Project Board	February 2019



		<p>“No overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target for indicator 1 of Outcome1 is changed to “draft Bill recommended to NEB after consultation with stakeholders from “Bill approved by Cabinet”</li> <li>• Target for indicator 2 of Outcome 1 is changed to “land use zoning for ES and critical habitat at these 5 provinces completed and submitted to the TCPD for inclusion in the provincial plans” from “At least 5 provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas”</li> <li>• Indicator 4 of Outcome 1 to include indicators 5, 9 and 10 in addition to the current score for indicator 2,3 and 11.</li> <li>• Baseline for Indicator 2 of Outcome 2 on Spoon-billed Sandpiper to be reduce to 2 from 4 at pilot location in Khok Kham. (This is in line with the suggestion made at the Inception)</li> <li>• Target for indicator 3 of Outcome 2 is ambiguous – “No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location”. It should be measured in the form of “ha pan salt” or “mudflats km2” or “ha of new aquaculture and development areas” between the start of the project and end of project, within the habitat in Khok Kham location. MTR team recommends that BCST/IUCN/ONEP to suggest this in the next PB based on the information available.</li> <li>• Baseline for indicator 3 of Outcome 2 on number of “wild Water Onion collected to exported out of Thailand” seems to be outdated from 2009 figures. There should have been updated data on this from Plan Quarantine Officials. MTR recommends that the baseline level use 2014/15/16 figure.</li> </ul>		
Project Management	2.	The project needs a no-cost extension of 6 months in order to have adequate time to complete all the activities of the revised work plan.	PB and UNDP	The new end of project date should be revised to March 2020
	3.	The regular communications between PMU and ONEP must be enhanced. They should meet every fortnight to discuss updates on implementation of activities without waiting for the PB’s meetings to resolve issues.	PMU/ONEP	On-going
	4.	PB must meet more often to ensure that the progress of the project and expedite decision making. In the current circumstances, the PB must meet at least three times this year to facilitate this.	PB	On-going
	5.	The project should urgently record the co-financing from the government – ONEP and ZPO, and other institutions like TEI, IUCN to reflect the contribution and commitment of Thailand toward this global biodiversity benefits in the form of ES conservation. The MTR team has provided examples of template to record in-kind co-financing for the use of the project. UNDP’s co-financing should also be recorded.	PMU/UNDP	On-going
Monitoring and Evaluation	6.	The GEF tracking tool, Capacity Assessment Scorecard need to be completed immediately in early 2019 and then do another one at the end of the project.	UNDP/ONEP/PMU	February 2019 and end of project

ES recovery and conservation plans at 3 sites	7.	The SBP conservation is the most difficult task for this project/Thailand. There are two forms of conservation reliance - whether management is directed toward populations or toward extrinsic threats. In the case of SBP both are very challenging. As such, there should be greater emphasis in the form of additional funding and urgent land use plan discussion at Samut Sakhon. This additional funding is not from the project but the project should assist the LPC to mobilise funding from ONEP or other donors or private sector to pursue the design and approval and implementation of local land use plan that provides the habitat protection for SPB. A community empowerment specialist need to be appointed to form strong grouping of the community there to support the SBP conservation. The project should assist in appointing a community engagement specialist for this purpose.	PMU/IUCN	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019
	8.	For Water Onion, a tourist coordinator/specialist need to be appointed so that the community's aspiration for a social enterprise using ecotourism can support sustain the habitat as well as regeneration of WO. In addition, the local provincial government should consider providing "temporary occupation licence" to the community on the use of the public land for sustainable livelihood in order to enhance ownership to this effort.	PMU/IUCN/ LPC	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019
	9.	In Buriram, the community are ready to create social enterprise to develop sustainable agriculture and to provide protection to ESC. The project should support the setting up of such entity.	PMU/ZPO	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019
Stakeholders' engagement	10.	The new Work Plan 2018-2019 should be verified with LAC and provincial stakeholders in order to get the support from them – the stakeholders need to know their roles, activities and budgets available for the remaining period of the project.	PMU/LPC	February 2019
	11.	The project should assists ONEP to set up the TWGs for outcome that involves direct functions of related agencies; TWG for eco-tourism, TWG for land use plans with TCP and TWG for Law with the AG office. The role of Tourism Authority and BEDO need to be redefined so that their involvement will be more meaningful and constructive through these TWGs. The TWGs should be responsible to report the achievements to the PB, instead of relying on the PMU. The RPs should not be driving the interagency coordination but rather facilitate this mechanism. The related agencies should be leading the TWGs. The TWGs will also benefit ONEP beyond the lifetime of the project to ensure the mainstreaming of biodiversity consideration in production landscapes in future.	PMU/PB/UND P/ONEP	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2019
Knowledge management and Communication	12.	Cross learning between the stakeholders in the 3 sites should be enhanced. There should be more field visits between them to learn from one another.	PMU/RPs/ UNDP	On-going
	13.	Knowledge products need to be developed to showcase the actions and results of the project. For example, the gender dimension in some of the sites are very impressive. These stories need to be told in outreach products.		
	14.	Project webpage/Facebook/ need to be created as soon as possible to enhance the awareness and support the project.		
Sustainability	15.	The project should develop an exit plan for sustainability of the outcomes. This is especially with the revised target of the indicator for Outcome 1 from ES Bill approved to draft bill submitted to NEB.	PMU/RP/ONE P/PB/ UNDP	On-going
	16.			

	17.	<p>Use the opportunity of the project to do capacity building of ONEP and the production landscape agencies on managing mainstreaming approach, including incentives and disincentive that can be incorporated into development plans of the agencies.</p> <p>The LPC should be institutionalised at the provincial level as the one-stop entity to organise and manage all ES species related funds, projects and activities from government, NGOs and private sector to synergise the ES conservation efforts.</p>		
--	-----	--	--	--

## Annex 1: MTR Terms of Reference

### UNDP-GEF MIDTERM REVIEW TERM OF REFERENCE (INTERNATIONAL MTR TEAM LEAD)

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

---

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes (PIMS#4839), implemented through Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP), which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on 22 September 2015 and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#).

#### 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

---

The objective of the project is to mainstream the conservation of globally important and endangered biodiversity into the management of production landscapes through improved management of critical habitats. At the national level, it will develop a legislative, regulatory and enforcement framework to guide endangered species (ES) and critical habitat conservation and management. This will be supported by capacity building within key ministries and agencies to enhance cross sector coordination in critical habitat management, and to effectively monitor critical habitats and ES to better inform decision makers.

These approaches will be piloted for three species namely the Eastern Sarus Crane (*Grus antigone sharpii*), the Spoon-billed Sandpiper (*Eurynorhynchus pygmeus*) and the Water Lily (*Crinum thaianum*) in three distinct geographical locations. Within each location the project will also build the capacity of local authorities, communities, private sector groups, and NGOs to develop environmentally friendly goods and services, which can provide a sound economic basis for ongoing critical habitat management and economic development.

#### 3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

---

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

#### 4. MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

---

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area and the Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the mid-term GEF focal area Tracking Tool that should be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR<sup>1</sup>. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field mission to Thailand, including the project sites in three pilot locations:

Khok Kham sub-district Samut Sakorn Province;  
Kaper and Suk-Samran Districts in Ranong Province, and the Kuraburi district in Phang Nga Province;  
Buriram Province.

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

Project Director (ONEP)  
Project Manager and Project Coordinator  
Field Coordinators  
Representatives from pilot areas  
Project Administrative/Financial Officer  
Members of Project Board  
IUCN (Responsible Party)  
Thailand Environment Institute (TEI)  
Bird Conservation Society of Thailand  
Tambon Administrative Officers  
The provincial branch of DTCP and PONRE  
Department of Local Administration (DLA)  
Other project consultants as appropriate  
UNDP Thailand Country Office in Bangkok

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

## 5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

---

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

### i. Project Strategy

#### Project design:

Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.

---

<sup>1</sup>For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?

Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?

Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.

If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

### Results Framework/Logframe:

Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?

Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

## **ii. Progress Towards Results**

### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

Project Strategy	Indicator <sup>2</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>3</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>4</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>5</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>6</sup>	Justification for Rating
<b>Objective:</b>	Indicator (if applicable):							
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
	Indicator 3:							

<sup>2</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>4</sup> If available

<sup>5</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>6</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
<b>Etc.</b>								

### **Indicator Assessment Key**

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.

Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

### **iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

#### Management Arrangements:

Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.

Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.

Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

#### Work Planning:

Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.

Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?

Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

#### Finance and co-finance:

Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.

Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?

Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

#### Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

#### Stakeholder Engagement:

Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?

Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

#### Reporting:

Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.

Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)

Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

#### Communications:

Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?

Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)

For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

#### **iv. Sustainability**

Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.

In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

##### Financial risks to sustainability:

What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

##### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key



stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

**Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:**

Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

**Environmental risks to sustainability:**

Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>7</sup>

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp;</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

<sup>7</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Adaptive Management		
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the contract will be approximately **27** working days from **1 November 2018 to 15 February 2019**.

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to Bangkok and the project sites in Buriram, Ranong, Phang Nga and Samut Sakhon, Thailand. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
1 November 2018	Contract begins Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
1-7 November 2018 (5 working days)	Project Document Review Submit MTR Inception Report to UNDP for review
12 November 2018	Finalization of the MTR Inception Report and re-submit to UNDP.
2 December 2018	Arrival in Bangkok of International Evaluation Team Lead
3-14 December 2018 (10 working days)	Inception meeting at UNDP Country Office Meeting with Project Director, ONEP and PMU team. MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews and field visits.
17-18 December 2018 (2 working days)	Preparation of presentations for wrap-up meeting.
19 December 2018 (1 working days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTR mission
4-8 January 2019 (5 working days)	Preparing draft report
9 January 2019 (0 working days for consultant)	Circulation of draft report with draft management response template for comments and completion
22-25 January 2019 (max: 4 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedbacks on draft report/Finalization of MTR report including Management Responses
15 February 2019	Expected date of contract closure

## 7. MTR DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	12 November 2018	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	19 December 2018	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	<b>Draft Final MTR Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	9 January 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

4	<b>Final MTR Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	25 January 2019 (or within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit
---	--------------------------	--	--	--------------------------------

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

## 8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

---

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit (UNDP Thailand Country Office). The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Thailand Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of the travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 9. TEAM COMPOSITION

---

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team local expert, from Thailand. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

### A. INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT

#### Profile

A Master's degree in Natural Sciences, Environmental Management, Environmental Studies, Development studies, Social Sciences and/or other related fields, or other closely related field (20%).

Minimum of 8 years accumulated and recognized experience in local government's biodiversity conservation and management, biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation areas, and sustainable livelihoods (20%)

Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)

Very good report writing skills in English (20%)

Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of FF is an advantage (10%).

Some experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations is an advantage (10%);

Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.

Excellent communication skills.

Demonstrable analytical skills.

#### Responsibilities

- Documentation review
- Leading the MTR Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports

- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Mid-term Review
- 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 MTR Report

## **B. National Consultant**

### **Profile**

At least a Master's degree in social development, public policy, environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)

Minimum of five (5) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management (20%).

Proven communication, facilitation, and writing skills.

Evaluation skills, including conducting interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, qualitative and quantitative analysis.

Excellent command of English both writing and speaking (20%)

Familiarity with Thailand national and local development policies, programs and projects (20%)

Some project management experience in local government biodiversity conservation, bio-diversity conservation and management and sustainable utilisation would be an advantage (10%).

Some knowledge of UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy would be an advantage (10%)

### **Responsibilities**

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

## **10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the draft MTR report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final MTR report

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed. Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. The provided living allowance will not be exceeding UNDP DSA rates. Repatriation travel cost from home to duty station in Bangkok and return shall not be covered by UNDP.

## Annex 2: MTR Evaluation Matrix

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</b>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			

## Annex 3: Rating Scales

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

## Annex 4: MTR mission itinerary

Date: 3-12 December 2018

Venue:

1. Kuraburi District, Phang Nga,
2. Suksamran District, Ranong
3. Huai Chorakae Mak and Huai Talad reservoir, Buriram
4. Kokkham sub-district, Samutsakorn

Specific objectives:

- 1) To assess progress towards achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in project document;
- 2) To assess sign of success and failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results; and
- 3) To review project's strategies, its risks to sustainability.

Date/ Time	Activities	Main objectives	Remark
<b>Monday 3 December 2018 – UN building, Introduction</b>			
09.00 – 10.30	Meeting with UNDP,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To discuss about objective and scope of mid-term review, tentative programme</li> <li>1) Ms. Lisa Farroway, Regional Technical Advisor</li> <li>2) Mrs. Napaporn Yuber, Programme Analyst</li> <li>3) Ms. Yenta Nungvaewdaeng, Project Assistant</li> </ul>	At UN building
10.30 -11.30	Depart UNDP for ONEP		
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch at restaurant near by ONEP		
13.00 – 14.00	Meeting with ONEP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ms. Jittinan, Director of Biodiversity Management Division</li> <li>2) Ms. Sukanya, ONEP,</li> <li>3) Ms. Usaras, ONEP</li> </ol>	Usarus: 081-811-6039
14.00 – 14.45	Meeting with BCST at ONEP meeting room	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ms. Nancy Gibson</li> <li>2) Ms. Thattaya Baydithaya, Project Officer, BCST</li> </ol>	Thataya : 081-304-5811
14.45 – 15.45	Depart ONEP for Don Muang Airport		
17.05 – 18.30	Depart Bkk-Ranong by Nok Air, <b>DD 7318</b>		Contact person: Tanu Nabnien: 081-891-5509, 081-397-0002 Usarus: 081-811-6309
	Travel to hotel		

Date/ Time	Activities	Main objectives	Remark
<b>Tuesday 4 December 2018 – Ranong and PhangNga, Visit</b>			
07.30-09.00	Depart from Hotel to Suksamran, Ranong		1 to 1.30 hour drive
09.00-11.00	<b>Suksamran-</b> Discussion and meeting with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sub-district administration representatives</li> <li>● Head of the villages</li> <li>● Representative of local conservation groups and local communities</li> </ul> Visit Water Lily sites in Suksamran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ongoing efforts of local conservation group</li> <li>● Challenges and success story</li> <li>● Expectation and recommendations from locals</li> </ul>	Contact person: Tanu Nabnien: 081-891-5509, 081-397-0002 Usarus: 081-811-6309  Venue TBC
11.00-12.30	<b>Suksamran-</b> Discussion and meeting with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provincial office of Natural Resources and Environment</li> <li>● Head of Wildlife Sanctuary, Department of national Parks, Wildlife and Plant conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provincial policies related to Water Lily and its habitat conservation</li> <li>● Collaboration with DNP</li> <li>● Recommendations and feedbacks on sustainable land use plan and integration of ES conservation</li> </ul>	Venue TBC
12.30-13.30	Lunch at Suksamran		Drive to Kuraburi, PhangNga Province, 40 minutes
14.30-16.00	<b>Kuraburi, PhangNga, -</b> Discussion and meeting with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sub-district administration representatives</li> <li>● Head of the villages</li> <li>● Representative of local conservation groups and local communities</li> </ul> Visit Water Lily sites in Kuraburi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ongoing efforts of local conservation group</li> <li>● Challenges and success story</li> <li>● Expectation and recommendations from locals</li> </ul>	Venue TBC
16.00-17.30	<b>Kuraburi-</b> Discussion and meeting with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provincial office of Natural Resources and Environment</li> <li>● TEI representatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Progress updates</li> <li>● Provincial policies related to Water Lily and its habitat conservation</li> <li>● Recommendations and feedbacks on sustainable land use</li> </ul>	Venue TBC



		plan and integration of ES conservation	
18.00 – 20 .00	Depart Kuraburi for Maung, Ranong hotel		
	Stay overnight in Ranong Dinner		
<b>Wednesday 5 December 2018 (Thai Public Holiday)</b>			
08.30 – 10.00	Depart for Ranong airport		
11.30 – 12.30	Flight back Ranong -Bangkok- by Nok Air, DD 7315		
<b>Date/ Time</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Main objectives</b>	<b>Remark</b>
<b>Thursday 6 December 2018 – Samutsakhon Visit</b>			
07.00	Depart Bangkok to Samutsakhon (Departure time)	Discuss with conservation network, <b>BCST</b> and key stakeholders	By Van
09.00	Arrive at the Bird Center, Khok kham Conservation Club	Welcome by BCST and Khok kham conservation group	Thataya : 081-304-5811 Sukanya: 089-699-4403
09:15 -12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with local stakeholders</li> <li>Field visit to the salt farms and interview the salt farmers</li> <li>Meeting and visit Woman group working on soap and other vocational groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of the ongoing activities of Khok kham conservation group</li> <li>Project deliverables contributing to the site and local communities</li> <li>Overview of achievement and challenges in 2018</li> <li>Expectation and recommendations from locals</li> </ul>	
12:00-13:30	Lunch		
13:30-16:30	Group discussion with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sub-district administration representatives</li> <li>- Head of the villages</li> <li>- Provincial office of Natural Resources and Environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress update</li> <li>The plan for legal framework applied to protect the habitats of SBS and collaboration with ONEP</li> <li>Next steps of works</li> </ul>	Thataya : 081-304-5811
16.30	Back to BKK	Consultant stay overnight in BKK	
<b>Date/ Time</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Main objectives</b>	<b>Remark</b>
<b>Friday 7 December 2018-Buriram Visit</b>			
07.30	Depart Bangkok to Buriram by Air Asia-FD 3522: (07:30 is departure time)		contact person Nuchjaree : 086-677-7060,
08.30-10.00	Arrive at Buriram airport		Van by ZPO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Having breakfast</li> <li>● Heading to Huai Chorakae Mak reservoir after breakfast</li> </ul>		
10.00-12.00	<b>Huai Chorakae Mak-</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Discussion and meeting with the head of non-hunting areas and ZPO staffs</li> <li>● Road trip around Huai Chorakae Mak and Huai Talad reservoir</li> <li>● Visit the construction site of Wetland and Eastern Sarus Crane Learning Center</li> <li>● Visit Eastern Sarus Crane Training area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Overview of the Eastern Sarus Crane Reintroduction project</li> <li>● Update on current status and management plan of Huai Chorakae Mak</li> <li>● Progress updates</li> <li>● Challenges and success story</li> </ul>	
12.00-13.30	<b>Lunch</b>		
13.30-16.30	<b>Sawaiso Community Enterprise</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Discussion and meeting with a head and members of the enterprise</li> <li>● Visit the organic rice farming Demonstration fields</li> <li>● Visit the Sarus Rice production processes and Other products</li> <li>● Talk to Local Ecotourism plan and activities</li> <li>● Meeting with school master and team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Perspective and Ideas for conservation engagement through GAP (good agricultural practice) farming and Sarus Rice product</li> <li>● Recommendations and feedbacks from locals Perceptions and school plan over Eastern Sarus Crane conservation program</li> </ul>	
16.30	Depart to Buriram airport		1 hour drive
19.10	Flight back to <b>BKK-DD 9609</b>		
20.25	Arrive at Don Muang Airport		
<b>Monday 10 December 2018 (National holiday)</b>			
08.00 – 09.00	Depart for TEI Office , Muang Thong, Thani		
09.00 – 10.00	Meeting with TEI	1) Ms. Benjamas Chotthong, TEI 2) Ms. Phuangpaka Khaokratoke, TEI	Puangpaka: 095-495-5528
10.30 – 11.30	Meeting with IUCN at TEI office	1) Supranee Kumpongsau, IUCN 2) Wilailak Suraphruk, IUCN, 3) On-iriya Fugthaworn, IUCN	On-iriya: 097-941-0566

11.30 – 13.00	Lunch at restaurant near by TEI		
13.00 -14.00	Travel back to hotel		
<b>Date</b>			
<b>Tuesday 11 December 2018</b>			
08.00 - 08.30	Depart hotel for ZPO office		contact person Nuchjaree : 086-677-7060
09.00 – 10.00	Meeting with ZPO	1) Mr. Boripat Siriaroonrat Director of Bureau of Conservation and Research, 2) Ms. Nucharee Purchkoon, Scientist	
10.00 – 10.30	Leaving ZPO for hotel or Office		
11.00 onward	Consolidate finding and Debriefing preparation		
<b>Thursday 12 December 2018</b>			
09.30 – 12.00	Debriefing with ONEP at ONEP Office	ONEP	
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch		
13.00 – 15.00	Debriefing with UNDP at UNDP Office	UNDP	

## **Annex 5: List of documents reviewed**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

## Annex 6: List of persons interviewed

Date/Time	1 <sup>st</sup> half of the day	2 <sup>nd</sup> half of the day
3 Dec 2018	UNDP Thailand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Napaporn Yuberk, Programme Analyst, IGSD Unit</li> <li>• Ms. Yenta Nungvaewdaeng, Project Assistant</li> </ul>	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Sukanya Wisan, Biodiversity Management Division</li> </ul> Bird Conservation Society of Thailand (BCST) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Nancy Gibson, Director</li> <li>• Ms. Thattaya Baydithaya, Project Officer</li> </ul> Travel to Ranong Province
4 Dec 2018	Visit Water Onion Conservation Sites in Kuraburi district, Phang Nga Province <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ven. Boonnop, Abbot of Suanwang temple</li> <li>• Mr. Lertsak Sriprom, Superintendent, Klong Nakha Wildlife Sanctuary</li> <li>• Ms. Jittima Kongsawat, Researcher, Klong Nakha Wildlife Sanctuary</li> </ul>	Visit Water Onion Conservation and Tourism Activity at Bann Rai-nai Village, Suksamran District, Ranong Province <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Terdtham Ramkaew, Chief Nakha Subdistrict</li> <li>• Mr. Sunthorn Srikwan, Chariman of Nakha TAO Council</li> <li>• Mr. AmarinPrasobphol, Village Committee</li> <li>• Ms. Sureeporn Promkarat, Village Committee</li> <li>• Mrs. Lamun Chiablaem, Women's Group</li> <li>• Mrs. Khai Butrvicha, Women's Group</li> </ul> Interview with Chief of Ranong Provincial Office of Natural Resources and Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Siriporn Tanbutr</li> </ul>
6 Dec 2018	Travel to Samut Sakhorn Province  Visit Bird Conservation Group, Salt-Farms and Salt-Based Products Groups in Khokkham , Samut Sakhorn Province <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Sakchai Netlomwong, Chairman Conservation Group</li> <li>• Mr. Suchart Daengpayon, Secretary Conservation Group</li> <li>• Mrs. Duangchan Kladkleep, Salt farmers and head of women's group</li> </ul>	Interview with local officials and community leaders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Boonlert Klinsuban, Village Head, Moo 3</li> <li>• Mr. Samroeng Lerkbangplad, Khokkham TAO</li> <li>• Mr. Wijarn Saengchan, TAO member</li> <li>• Mr. Pichit Saengchan, TAO member</li> <li>• Representative of Samut Sakhorn Provincial Office of Natural Resources and Environment</li> <li>• Mrs. Duangchan Kladkleep, Women's Group</li> <li>• Mr. Suchart Daengpayon, Conservation Group</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Thataya Baydithaya, BCST</li> </ul>
7 Dec 2018	<p>Travel to Burirum Province</p> <p>Meeting with heads and staff of non-hunting areas and ZPO staff at Chorakae Mak Reservoir</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Permsak Kanitthachart, Head of Huay Chorakae Mak Non-Hunting Area</li> <li>Mr. Kamol Thanthum, Head of Huay Talad Non-Hunting Area</li> <li>Mr. Prapan Thammarat, Field Officer, Huay Chorakae Mak Non-Hunting Area</li> <li>Mr. Anan Nachampa, Field Officer, Huay Chorakae Mak Non-Hunting Area</li> <li>Mr. Ittichet Amarakum, Field Officer, Huay Chorakae Mak Non-Hunting Area</li> <li>Mr. Wlnai Taprakhon, Field Officer, Huay Chorakae Mak Non-Hunting Area</li> <li>Mr. Kawee Rodaree, Field Officer, Huay Chorakae Mak Non-Hunting Area</li> <li>Mr. Nattawat Paengkratok, ZPO Field Researcher</li> <li>Ms. Chuthamat Chanta, Project Coordinator</li> </ul>	<p>Sawaiso Community Enterprise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Thongpoon Ounchit, Chairman Organic Rice Group</li> <li>Mrs. Prathana Ounchit, Member Organic Rice Group (in charge of QC and Marketing)</li> </ul> <p>Visit Eastern Sarus Crane Learning Center at Bannongmakhua School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school Director</li> <li>Teacher in charge of Learning Center Management</li> <li>A group of girl students serving as tour guides around the center</li> </ul> <p>Travel back to Bangkok</p>
10 Dec 2018	<p>Interview with TEI team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Phuangpaka Khaokratoke</li> <li>Ms. Wilavan Noipa</li> <li>Ms. Attjala Roongwong</li> <li>Ms. Tanirat Tanawat</li> </ul> <p>Interview with IUCN team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Supranee Kampongsun</li> <li>Ms. Wilailak Suraphruk</li> <li>As. On-iriyā Fugthaworn</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consolidation of key findings</li> </ul>
11 Dec 2018	<p>Interview with ZPO project team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Boripat Siriaroonrat, Director Bureau of Conservation and Research</li> <li>Ms. Nutcharee Purchkoon, Scientist</li> </ul>	<p>Preparation for debriefing on initial findings</p>

12 Dec 2018	Debriefing of initial findings at ONEP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Usarus Chanphakdi, ONEP</li> <li>• Ms. Wilailak Suraphruk, IUCN</li> <li>• Ms. On-iriya Fugthaworn, IUCN</li> </ul>	Debriefing of initial findings at UNDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Lovita Ramguttee, UNDP's Deputy Resident Representative</li> <li>• Ms. Napaporn Yuber, Programme Analyst, IGSD Unit</li> <li>• Ms. Yenta Nungvaewdaeng, Project Assistant</li> </ul>
-------------	---	--

## Annex 8. Signed UNEG Code of Conduct Form

### Evaluators/Consultants:

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_Hari Ramalu Ragavan\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_AKAR Asia Consulting\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at \_\_\_\_Kuala Lumpur\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_14.3.2019\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Signature:  \_\_\_\_\_



**Evaluators/Consultants:**

8. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
14. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Consultant: Walaitat Worakul

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 Chiang Mai, Thailand (Place) on 14.3.2019 (Date)

Signature:  \_\_\_\_\_

**Annex 9: Signed MTR final report clearance form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: Napaporn Yuberk, Programme Analyst \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: 

Date: 25 April 2019

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: Lisa Farroway

Signature: 

Date: 26 April 2019