

# **Final Report**

Mid-term Review Report

**Strengthening the Capacity of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to address the Risk  
of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events**

Project ID: 00074912

June 2013

**Contents:**

<b>Executive Summary</b>	1
<b>1. Background</b>	
1.1. Introduction	2
1.2. Project Budget	4
1.3. Evaluation Purposes and Methods	4
1.4. Methodology of the MTR	4
<b>2. Findings</b>	
2.1. Project Design	5
2.2. Project Implementation	8
2.3. Project Results	19
2.4. Project Management	25
2.5. Conclusion and summary of findings	29
<b>3. Lessons Learned, Recommendations and Exit Strategy</b>	
3.1. Lessons Learned	30
3.2. Recommendations	31
3.3. Exit Strategy	32

**Annexes:**

- Annex 1: ToR
- Annex 2: List of documents reviewed
- Annex 3: List of persons met

## List of Acronyms:

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CBDRM	Community-based Disaster Risk Management
CBOs	Community-based Organizations
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCR	Coastal Community Resilience
CRR	Climate Risk Reduction
CVCA	Community-based Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment
DDPM	Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation
DMCR	Department of Marine and Coastal Resources
DNP	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plants Conservation
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
FG	Focus Group
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
INCA	Strengthening the Capacity of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to address the Risk of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
KII	Key Informant Interview
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOI	Ministry of Interior
MONRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid Term Review
NCCC	National Climate Change Committee
NGOs	Non-Government Organizations
NPM	National Project Manager
ONEP	Office of National Environment Plan
PB	Project Board
PMU	Project Management Unit
RRAFA	Foundation of Reclaiming Rural Agriculture and Food sovereignty Action
RCHB	Relief and Community Health Bureau
SAN	Sustainable Agricultural Network
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SDF	Sustainable Development Foundation
SEA-START	Southeast Asia Global Change System for Analysis, Research and Training
TAG	Technical Advisory Group
TAO	Tambon Administrative Organization
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainer
TRCS	Thai Red Cross Society
TST	Technical Support Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VCA	Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment

# VRA Vulnerability Reduction Assessment

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The “Strengthening the Capacity of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to address the Risk of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events” known as INCA project is the project implemented in three provinces of Southern Thailand, namely Trang, Pattalung and Nakorn-si-Thammarat. The project is being implemented by Thai Red Cross Society (TRCS) in partnership with the Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation (DDPM), Sustainable Development Foundation (SDF) and Southeast Asia Global Change System for Analysis, Research and Training (SEA-START).

The main objective of the project is to increase the adaptive capacity of vulnerable coastal communities in Thailand to climate change-related risks and extreme weather events. This is to be achieved through four main outcomes: i) Increased knowledge and awareness of climate-related risks and impacts in vulnerable coastal communities; ii) Increased climate risk management and disaster preparedness capacity in vulnerable coastal communities; iii) Integration of climate change adaptation into provincial development plans and sector policies; and iv) Project knowledge captured, disseminated and replicated through dedicated follow-up activities.

The purpose of the MTR is to examine the performance and achievement of the project up to the time of the review by a) highlighting initial and potential impacts, b) addressing underlying causes and issues contributing to targets not adequately achieved, c) identifying weaknesses and strengths of the project design and management and coming up with recommendations on any necessary changes, and d) identifying lessons learned and giving recommendations – particularly on the exit strategy. A range of evaluation methods were used, including a desk review, interviews and focus groups.

The main conclusions are that the project has been rather effective in contributing to the project's main objective, and has thus to some degree contributed to the development of methods for communities to identify their climate change (CC) risk reduction priorities and to develop concrete adaptation proposals and implementation. However, there has been limited progress in integrating the community CC risk reduction plans into existing district and provincial development plans, and to capture, manage and disseminate knowledge of project results nationally and internationally.

The main lessons learned is that the systematic design on the use of technical inputs and backstopping at all levels is the key factor for the achievement of the CC complex issue. Additionally, having a number of implementing partners with different experiences and approaches working in many sites in 3 provinces is a big challenge for a project, and both the time and budget that the INCA project has been allotted are too limited.

It is recommended that an exit strategy be conducted that a) focuses (selects, develops and sustains) on the most successful small grant activities in each province, b) develops IEC materials on lesson learned and best practice and c) conducts an end of project forum for summing up and dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned by using the IEC materials developed.

## 1. BACKGROUND

### 1.1. Introduction

The INCA project, “Strengthening the Capacity of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to address the Risk of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events”, is a national project to address the issue of climate change adaptation and disaster preparedness that involves three southern coastal provinces of Thailand. The project is being implemented by the Thai Red Cross Society (TRCS) in partnership with the Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation (DDPM), Sustainable Development Foundation (SDF), and Southeast Asia Global Change System for Analysis, Research and Training (SEA-START), with support from UNDP under the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project is implemented over a period of 3 years, from January 2010 until the end of December 2013.

The Overall Objective is to increase the adaptive capacity of vulnerable coastal communities in Thailand to climate change-related risks and extreme weather events. The Objective is to integrate the climate change vulnerabilities and adaptation options of coastal communities into development planning processes in three provinces of southern Thailand. This is to be achieved through four main Outcomes: 1) Increased knowledge and awareness of climate-related risks and impacts in vulnerable coastal communities; 2) Increased climate risk management and disaster preparedness capacity in vulnerable coastal communities; 3) Integration of climate change adaptation into provincial development plans and sector policies; and 4) Project knowledge captured, disseminated and replicated through dedicated follow-up activities.

The four project outcomes and twelve outputs are summarized in Table 1 below.

*Table 1. List of project outcomes and outputs*

Outcome 1: Increased knowledge and awareness of climate-related risks and impacts in vulnerable coastal communities	Output 1.1: Climate change vulnerabilities and adaptation options of 10 target communities systematically analyzed and documented through participatory and gender-sensitive climate change Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCA)
	Output 1.2: Key public service providers and decision-makers at the sub-district and village levels have increased ability to integrate climate risk reduction and community-based adaptation into coastal development planning
	Output 1.3: Priority community climate risk

	reduction (CRR) Proposals integrated into Community Development Plans and submitted for approval and financing by sub-district government
	Output 1.4: Increased TRCS and DDPM capacity for integrating climate change risks into DRM planning and practice
<i>Outcome 2</i> ; Increased climate risk management and disaster preparedness capacity in vulnerable coastal communities	Output 2.1: Up to 10 small-scale adaptation grants provided to target communities to demonstrate priority climate risk reduction measures identified in their Climate Risk Reduction Action Plans
	Output 2.2: The effectiveness and adaptation potential of at least 2 community-based adaptation measures in target coastal sub-districts systematically assessed
<i>Outcome 3</i> : Integration of climate change adaptation into provincial development plans and sector policies	Output 3.1: Priority community climate risk reduction proposals submitted for provincial government approval and financing
	Output 3.2: Provincial decision-makers, planners and line ministry staff in 3 target provinces understand climate change risks and know how to integrate climate risk reduction measures into coastal development planning
	Output 3.3: Recommendations for strengthening coastal climate risk reduction and community-based adaptation developed and discussed with provincial decision-makers
<i>Outcome 4</i> : Project knowledge captured, disseminated and replicated through dedicated follow-up activities	Output 4.1: Project knowledge and lessons learned systematically analyzed and documented
	Output 4.2: Increased awareness of climate change risks and community-based adaptation options and experiences among coastal communities in Thailand
	Output 4.3: Project knowledge and lessons learned disseminated nationally through

	websites, adaptation networks, the media and public events
--	--

**1.2. Project Budget:**

The project has a total budget of USD 3,573,863. Funding is provided by the GEF administered Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) to the amount of US 869,091. The Thailand Red Cross Society together with UNDP and SDF have co-financed the total amount of USD 2,704,772 in form of in-kind and parallel contribution of which USD 1,792,950 from TRCS, USD 552,822 from UNDP and USD 359,000 from SDF respectively.

**1.3. Evaluation Purposes and Methods:**

The Mid Term Review (MTR) of the INCA project was carried out in accordance with UNDP/GEF monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, which encourage projects with long implementation periods to carry out mid-term evaluation.

The purpose of the MTR is to:

- highlight initial and potential impacts of the project, and address underlying causes and issues contributing to targets not adequately achieved.
- identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and come up with recommendations for any necessary changes in overall design and orientation of the project.
- assess project performance and achievements up to the time of the review.
- identify lessons learned and give recommendations particularly on the exit strategy for the purpose of adjustment of the project activities during the remaining months of the project duration.

It is expected to serve as means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance and effectiveness obtained from the monitoring. The MTR provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. It will also identify initial impacts brought about by the project.

The scope of the review was to investigate 5 key elements. This includes: 1) Project Design; 2) Project Implementation; 3) Project Results; 4) Project Management; and 5) Lesson Learned, Recommendations and Exit Strategy.

**1.4. Methodology of the MTR:**

The MTR applied a combination off data collection methods to respond to different stakeholder needs and to enable triangulation of results to strengthen the findings. The



MTR consists of Mr. Pituck Jongnarangsin (National Consultant/Team Leader) and Mr. Palle Havmoller (Locally-based International Consultant). Full Terms of Reference with respective roles and responsibilities are provided in Annex 1.

The MTR methodology is focused on the assessment of the implementation process and the achievement of the project in which the “Process Orientation” and “Result Orientation” approaches are set to be a platform for the overall review. Process orientation is used in order to assess the level of the project performance by using the process indicators to assess the progress of the project implementation according to the original plan. The results deriving from the implementation plan, progress of the project in terms of performance (management) and the financial disbursement are also assessed.

The Review was initiated with a desk review of a range of secondary data, which included reviewing relevant project documents to assess project progress to date. This includes project document, project implementation plan, progress reports and financial reports. A list of reviewed documents is provided in Annex 2.

The mission methodology included Key Informant Interview (KII) with key stakeholders from government, NGOs, local government, PMU, member of Provincial Committee, and UNDP. Interviews provided a comprehensive overview of project design and implementation to date, as well as insights into operations, policies, and procedures and an indication of result achieved and lessons learned.

Focus Groups (FG) were also used to enable the communities’ members to share their perspectives in relation to the implementation and results to date, as well as to assess local levels of understanding and awareness on climate change adaptation and the project concept. A total of 93 people attended through community focus groups in the three provinces. A list of focus group participants is provided in Annex 3.

## **2. FINDINGS**

This section assesses project design; implementation results; and management in accordance with the Mid Term Review ToR and related key questions and sub-questions. The findings are classified in accordance with the scope of work of each key component including design, implementation, results, and management.

A 4-point rating is provided for key elements evaluated -Unsatisfactory (U); Marginally Satisfactory (MS); Satisfactory (S) and Highly Satisfactory (HS).

### **2.1. Project Design**

The project document is given a clear direction for the implementation and is well formulated with the designed log-frame in line with UNDP’s guidelines on result-based management, with strategy and objectives reflecting GEF/UNDP overall goals. The log-

frame and the overall project design also responds to the Thai government's needs and priorities.

As a general model, the sequence of the project logical framework approach is sound, coherent and appropriate for increasing the adaptive capacity of vulnerable coastal communities in Thailand to climate change-related risks and extreme weather events. The consequence of the design can be summarized as follows:

- Outcome 1 provides the platform for raising the CCA awareness and knowledge of climate change risks and impact through the use of VCA.
- Outcome 2 provides the opportunity for the community to directly implement the CCA activities.
- Outcome 3 ensures the effort to address and integrate the results generated from the project into a development plan at different levels.
- Outcome 4 aims at capturing, managing and disseminating knowledge of the project's results locally, nationally and internationally.

The project approach using three demonstration sites in three coastal provinces is particularly relevant for the CCA in Thailand's coastal communities affected by climate change. The project was formulated with the underlying assumptions that there are:

- Limitations in the institutional and policy framework for coastal zone management;
- Limitations of public participation in coastal zone decision-making;
- Insufficient knowledge about climate change risks and adaptation among local communities and governments; and
- Weak inter-sector coordination on climate change and Disaster Risk Management (DRM).

These assumptions remained fully valid at the onset of project execution. Since then, some progress has been made on all assumptions although there is a clear variation on progress and it needs to be consolidated and made sustainable in the time that remains.

Although the project design is adequate at a macro level, there seem to be limitations in the design as follows:

#### The number of intervention sites versus budget allocation

The project was designated to work in 3 provinces with initially 10 communities as the targeted intervention sites. When considering the size of the budget allocation, it seems that the numbers of site intervention in comparison to the level of budget allocation is too ambitious, as an appropriate number – as well as the size of site interventions – are likely to be the key factors for the achievement of the project. As a matter of fact, the project

with the proper number of activity sites and proper budget size can be focused and make use of limited resources, thereby reducing complications for the management (both operationally and financially). The “*less is more*” principle in the design is thus considered to be an advantage to this kind of CC pilot project.

#### Project intervention partners

The number of partners who are taking part in the implementation process is also considered as one of the main obstacles for the integration of the development plan and implementing activities. Although the TRCS is the implementing partner, SDF and SEA-START were also identified as main partners responsible for the overall project intervention. At the same time, there are a number of local NGOs (e.g. Andaman Network, Thai Sea Watch Association, Sustainable Agriculture Network) involved in the implementation at site levels. In addition to this, an appointed Provincial Committee in Nakorn-si-Thammarat consisting of different stakeholders at local level also play a significant role in some part (i.e. Outcome 2) of the intervention of the project. Such a large number of parties engaged in one project can lead to lack of effective coordination, communication and coherency of the project.

#### Technical input and backstopping

Regarding the design at management level, there seems to be a weakness in the technical aspects. The technical input and backstopping is also regarded as a key factor contributing to the success of the project. The Climate Change issue is relatively new and complex, and thus requires specific technical input at different levels.

Despite the recognized role of SEA-START as a single technical input and backstopping provider of CC related scientific data and information (e.g. map and scenario analysis), there are also other areas of CC related issues that require technical input and backstopping necessary for the implementation, particularly at site level (e.g. rice production development, additional income generation and, mangrove plantation and etc.). In this respect, it appears that the technical input at local level are not an important part of the project design. Therefore, there is a need for an effective Technical Advisory Group (TAG) that can provide technical guidelines at all levels. There also seems to be a lack of technical backstopping from Project Management Unit (PMU), as this responsibility was not clearly reflected in the job description. The fact is that there is little technical backstopping provided for the implementation at project sites to ensure that the designed activities will be of sustainable benefit to targeted communities.

Table 2: Summary of Project Design issues

Key Issue in Project Design	Rating
Intervention sites and budget allocation	U
Intervention partners	MS
Technical inputs and backstopping	MS
Overall project design	MS

## 2.2. Project Implementation:

This section assesses the extent to which the project is achieving its Overall Objective and four Outcomes. The overview of project implementation is mainly based on information extracted from the Project Document, Project Inception Report, 4 quarterly Operational Reports Jan- Dec 2011, 4 quarterly Progress Reports Jan.-Dec.2012, 2 Project Back to office reports from Oct 2011 and July 2012, interviews and discussions with key stakeholders centrally and in the field, and observations during the field trips.

### Outcome 1: Increased knowledge and awareness of climate-related risks and impacts in vulnerable coastal communities:

The development of Climate Change VCA is considered a key element in Outcome 1, providing the platform for the implementation of the project. The objective of VCA's development is set to bring together local knowledge with the best available climate change science and adaptation knowledge in order to help communities articulate both their climate change problems and identify potential community-based solutions.

The VCA process was started in 2011 right after the inception phase. A core team consisting of representative from SEA-START, DDPM, TRCS and, SDF together with UNDP was formed to work on the development of the VCA. The VCA methodology was initially discussed among the core team with the use of CCR guideline (How Resilient is Your Coastal Community?: A Guide for Evaluating Coastal Community Resilience to Tsunamis and Other Hazards U.S. Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System Program 2007), Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA) guideline, and the Community-based Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (CVCA) guideline in order to develop the approach and methodology for the VCA. The purpose of the use of these three guidelines was to ensure that the VCA was modified to integrate and harmonize the approach focusing on disaster management and natural resources management. Later, the result was submitted to the Working Committee to seek for technical advise on the VCA approach and methodology but it was not able to come up with constructive advice and

recommendation on the developed guideline and the approach. Therefore, there was no report on the systematic VCA guideline to be used for the preparation. In parallel, the SEA-START also conducted a Climate Change Scenario Analysis, which was expected to be used in the process of VCA preparation.

The Training of the Trainer (ToT) was conducted with the participation of all parties involved in order to train on the preparation and development of the VCA. A consultant, who is the expert on VCA, was hired to facilitate in the process with the presentation from SEA-START particularly on the Climate Change concept and Climate Change Scenario. The ToT has resulted in the capacity of staff both from TRCS and SDF to be able to prepare the VCA based on the materials received from the training.

In term of preparation, It is stated in the Project Document that, and within each target sub-district, a sub-national VCA team consisting of representatives from local community, major NGOs/CBOs and the concerned TAO, would be established. The Project Document envisaged that the team should include an appropriate mix of technical expertise and community facilitation skills to ensure that the process and VCA outputs are community-driven while also ensuring that discussions remain focused and that the information collected is documented and analyzed systematically. In reality, however, no VCA team was established for the VCA purpose neither at central nor local levels. In fact, the process of VCA preparation and development were different between TRCS and SDF.

In Nakorn-si-Thammarat, the field officers under TRCS12 prepared the VCA with the technical support from hired consultant and SEA-START. The consultant conducted training on VCA with the participation from those who were engaging in the VCA preparation at targeted sites. The VCA report was submitted for the approval from the Provincial Committee.

On the other hands, SDF developed its own methodology focusing on the involvement of community directly in the process of VCA preparation though community meetings and formation of village committees in the targeted communities in Trang and Pattalung provinces. SDF and their local NGO partners facilitated the process for VCA development through the series of community meetings. A workshop on integrating gender dimension into the VCA process was also conducted in 2nd quarter of 2011 by SDF. A study visit was arranged also by SDF for participating communities from Pattalung and Trang to Samut Sakorn, Nakhon Pathom and Surin as well as a knowledge and experience exchange visit between target communities from Trang and Pattalung and formation of community cooperative groups. As a result, the produced VCA report took

longer time in the case of Pattalung and Trang provinces than in Nakorn-si-Thammrat as the process of development are different.

### *Knowledge and awareness of Climate Change*

In general, the MTR observed and learned during discussions with some members of the communities that the targeted communities have positively responded to the questions on the climate change risks and impacts. Climate Change questions were asked during the discussions and visits to small grant sites with community groups, and by repeating the same questions to different members of the groups. The set of questions include:

- What are the likely effects from Climate Change that their community faces?
- What would be the consequences of Climate Change (positive or negative impacts) on the community?
- How do they know that the occurrences are caused by Climate Change?
- What kinds of risks from climate change have the most impact on their lives?

It is a fact that most of community members were able to more or less respond to the questions whilst admitting that their awareness and knowledge of climate change risks and impacts have increased through the VCA process. However, it is premature to conclude that the level of awareness and knowledge on CC risk and impacts of the target communities are increasing at this stage. This is because the MTR team only had the possibility to interview a small number of community members, and it is still possible that CC knowledge has not reached all members of the community. There was, however, no time or opportunity for the MTR to conduct a more extensive survey or conduct a workshop for a larger number of communities. It is therefore recommended that the project conducts such a survey in connection with a summing up workshop towards the end of the project to learn whether the VCA training and experience have had a deep enough impact and to repeat the most important CCA issues for the communities.

It is important to note that the ToT workshops and knowledge exchange from field visits also appear to have contributed to this increase in CC knowledge and awareness. The exchange visits between communities in Trang and Pattalung were mentioned by some communities as also being very useful for their work with climate change adaptation measures.

### *VCA Development and reports*

VCA is a useful tool to generate knowledge of the best available climate change science and adaptation knowledge to help communities understand their climate change problems and help make them capable of identifying potential community-based solutions. The different development approaches and methods of VCA and the produced reports (both from TRCS and SDF) are the constraint of this part.

As mentioned earlier, TRCS and SDF employed differences in both approach and methodology in the preparation and implementation of the VCA. TRCS has, according to the VCA report, focused the assessment based on the disaster management viewpoint, while SDF applied the development approach for the preparation of the VCA. The methods that TRCS and SDF have applied in carrying out the VCA process also differ. SDF has prepared the VCA by forming community groups to work directly in the process of VCA with advice and support from SDF and partner NGOs. On the other hand, TRCS has developed the VCA through the TRCS12 field team supervised by the provincial committee. SEA-START provided technical support mainly on CC scenario analysis, including history of climate related disasters which had occurred in the area, together with maps based on Google Earth and aerial photos of the three provinces with , for example, district and sub-district boundaries to both TRCS and SDF.

The produced VCA reports (both from TRCS and SDF) appear to lack in in-depth analysis of the CC problems and risks, due to their rather limited use of scientific data and information for the assessment. It appears to the MTR that the produced VCA reports contain only baseline information (e.g. socio-economic, disaster and environment problems, current situation, etc.); nor is there an in-depth analysis providing the connection illustration of the logical linkage between the impacts of CC and risks in targeted areas. Furthermore, there is a limitation for the use of maps showing change through time in each area, such as coastlines, fish stocks, coral reefs, sea grass and mangrove and beach forest occurrences. It would have been useful if the maps also showed the areas that are most prone to CC disasters such as land-slides, coastal erosion, floods, etc., as there now are developed models that can, to a certain degree of accuracy, pinpoint such areas. It also appears that there was no established sufficient linkages/partnerships with local universities and other local research centers such as fishery and coastal research centers, who may be able to provide up-to-date information on climate change issues for use in the analysis of the VCA reports.

With regards to the priority community climate risk reduction (CRR) proposals integrated into community development plans and submitted for approval and financing by sub-district government, there was no concrete achievement on this part. Resulting from the interview with some TAO staff, there is a positive response on the activity, but there is no concrete evidence of the integration of the community climate risk reduction (CRR) proposal to be integrated in the Community Development Plans. However, there is a positive response from a particular TAO – in the case of Jong Thanon district in Pattalung province – who address the possibility for the TAO to provide financial support to the activity in the future.

With regards to the increased TRCS and DDPM capacity for integrating climate change risks into DRM planning and practice, it is unfortunate that the MTR was not able to make the assessment on the capacity of the DDPM due to the fact that there is no

opportunity for MTR to discuss this issue with the DDPM. Moreover, it seems that there is no actual role and budget allocation for the DDPM in the implementation process. As for the TRCS, it is a fact that the PMU is set up as an ad hoc unit, and it seems that the project is mainly maneuvered by externally hired staff. It appears that there is no involvement of other TRCS staff from other sections in the implementation. In this respect, the MTR is not in the position to make the assessment of the TRCS' capacity for integrating climate change risks into DRM planning and practice

Outcome 2: Increased climate risk management and disaster preparedness capacity in vulnerable coastal communities:

The main purpose of Outcome 2 is to increase the capacity of targeted communities to implement priority risk reduction measures identified in the Climate Risk Reduction Action Plans. The VCA process has resulted in a Climate Risk Reduction Action Plan prepared by SDF for the small grant activities in Trang and Pattalung.

The small grant activities in each of the 3 provinces, and results of implementing each of these, are described in details under the result section of each province. The following will therefore primarily deal with the different approaches that TRCS and SDF applied to conduct small grant activities including the analysis of strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

In general, the project has facilitated the preparation of the community climate risk reduction plans and preparation of proposals for small grant activities as well as the process of monitoring and documenting them. The project core team provided advice and suggestions on how the proposals could be improved to better address the climate change adaptation process. The production of the VCA report was planned to be initiated just after the inception workshop in early 2011 and to be completed during 2011, but the process was delayed and the report was first presented and discussed in a workshop conducted towards the end of 2012. The extent to which the VCA process and resulting reports have informed the formulation of the small grant activities appears therefore to be rather limited.

The small grant activities have been under implementation with most of them initiated and completed at the end of 2012. There have been delays in implementing some of the activities mostly due to the delay in budget release, seasonal weather conditions and delays in producing the VCA report. There have also been the legal limitations on what activities the communities can conduct within some of the sites as they are parts of protected areas, i.e. Had Chao Mai National Park and Koh Libong Wildlife Sanctuary.

TRCS employed a top-down administrative and management set up for the intervention in Nakorn-si-Thammarat province. A Provincial Committee was officially appointed by the Provincial Governor with the representatives from government line agencies at



provincial level and a local university as committee members. The role of the Provincial Committee is to both supervise and approve the proposal submitted by the communities. There are also sub-committees under the provincial committee for monitoring the grant activities. It should be noted that local technical consultants and the Provincial committee play a vital role in the preparation of small grant activity proposals that were later discussed, revised and approved by the provincial committee. To ensure that the proposals met the technical requirement obtained from the VCA report and respond to the actual need of the communities, a Technical Support Team (TST) under TRCS12 was set up to assist and facilitate the targeted communities in the process of developing and implementing small grant activities. Due to the TRCS' restrictions in the financial procedures, which do not allow the TRCS to transfer money directly to the community, it has been decided that the funds for small grant activities are allocated and managed through SEA-START. It was also decided that the community has the responsibility to manage funds directly. A budget ranging from USD 3,000 to USD 21,000 for each proposal was later approved by the Provincial Committee in Nakorn-si-Thammarat.

In contrast, SDF applies a bottom-up approach by working through their local NGOs' partners. In Pattalung and Trang provinces, SDF together with partner NGOs, formed an area-based committee working directly with community groups to prepare proposals with (rather limited) technical assistance from PMU, SEA-START and local institutions. The project's financial support for activities here was not disbursed in the strictly small grant format like in the case of Nakorn-si-Thammarat. SDF received lump-sums that in addition to small grant budgets also included budgets to facilitate the discussions of the area-based committees to come up with community plans later proposed to be integrated into the district and provincial development plans.

It is significant to note that SDF has been able to react quickly to the budget delays by initially advancing its own funds for important activities, until the funds from the project were released. This appears to have had a positive effect on the discussions and work of the area based committees and their preparation of community plans for CCA and also on the ultimate impact of the small grant activities as they appear to be in a more advanced stage and more stabilized and sustainable than the small grant activities in Nakorn-si-Thammarat. This is to some degree due to SDF's long-time experience in working with communities in many parts of Thailand on community strengthening activities similar to the CCA activities. One of the MTR observations is that the grant activities in both Trang and Pattalung might require a longer time for creating the impact at the community level. In this regard, It can be assumed that the more advanced stage of implementing grant activities to some degree appears to have built on or extended some previously initiated community activities (e.g. the mixed rubber plantations establishment and some of the alternative livelihood activities such as home stays, crab banks and alternative rice production).

Having two different approaches to community engagement and the formulation of CCA action plans (as practiced by SDF and TRCS) has proven to be both a strength and weakness for the project: it is a strength as they have supplemented each other, and a weakness in that it has also sometimes created a lack of cooperation and coordination (e.g. SDF arranged valuable exchange visits between communities in Trang and Pattalung, but communities from Nakorn-si-Thammarat were not included in these activities). There are pros and cons in these two different implementations of the small grant activities approaches which can be summarized as follows:

Strength of SDF's approach:

- The “learning by doing” principle in the process of forming community groups to prepare VCA and CCA plans as well as small grant proposals creates a strong sense of ownership for the community
- The long-time presence of SDF and the local partner NGOs engaged in the 2 provinces has generally created good contacts and built strong relationships among the concerned parties, communities, institutions and line agencies
- The ecosystem approach applied, mostly in Pattalung, has been an appropriate tool to create cooperation between concerned communities in the watershed areas, and to raise awareness of the importance of maintaining or establishing forests to mitigate CC induced landslide and flooding risks.

Weakness of SDF's approach:

- The strong focus on communities appears to have caused delays in producing the VCA report, created a certain lack of contact to local universities and research stations, and caused delays and weak technical assessment of the grant proposals
- The area-based committees in Trang and Pattalung have only had a supervisory role and acted as a networking unit, both of which have no actual decision making in the management process.

Strength of TRCS's approach:

- TRCS has historically been implementing community based disaster risk management (CBDRM) together with the provincial Department of Disaster Prevention Mitigation (DDPM), and has used this close contact to develop grant proposals
- TRCS is a highly respected organization at all levels, from community over provincial, regional to national level, and it has been easy for them to create contacts at all levels in the province.

- TRCS has had many years of presence at the target sites and has, through close contact with the Provincial Governor, been able to rather quickly establish a project provincial committee with authority.

Weakness of TRCS approach:

- The approach of having local consultants, SEA-START and the provincial committee involved in preparation of the VCA and CCA – including proposals for small grant activities and the provincial committee to approve them – appears to have caused delays and a lack of ownership among involved communities.

As mentioned earlier, gender issues in relation to CCA and small grant activities were presented in a workshop conducted before the preparation of CCA and small grant activities. This could to some extent be the reason why the community groups that the MTR met in the field in all provinces were mostly composed of women. The gender issues in coastal communities appears thus not to be a serious issue, at least not at the level of community groups. The project management staffs, both centrally and in the field, are also mainly women.

Outcome 3: Integration of climate change adaptation into provincial development plans and sector policies.

There have been several efforts from the project to integrate CCA into provincial development plans and sector policies. There was, for example, the establishment of the Provincial Committee in Nakorn-si-Thammarat appointed by the Governor with the first meeting held in Nakorn-si-Thammarat in early 2012 to update committee members on project activities and to get approval of the small grants activities in the province. The MoU between TRCS12 and the provincial office was also signed to ensure progress of the integration of the action plans into the provincial development plan despite the fact that there is no follow up in the integration of this such action plan into the provincial development plan. The project field staff also participated in local development planning processes in several districts and held a meeting with DDPM to update on progress. Community representatives from Pattalung and Trang were invited to share their experiences at a DDPM national forum on climate change adaptation. The field team in Pattalung coordinated and involved the TAO in the fishing gear revolving fund. SDF and local partners in the second half of 2012 organized the first provincial committee meetings in Trang and Pattalung.

Knowledge sharing and network building among key responsible parties were developed during a National Forum on coastal resources conservation and climate change adaptation held in Nakorn-si-Thammarat in the end of 2012. This event saw the participation of staff from government, NGOs, civil society and community leaders.

Although there were various efforts from the project to achieve Outcome 3, the level of achievement has been fairly low. The main reason is the top-down attitude and reluctance to involve community and NGOs in planning and decision making in the policy set up. It is the MTR's opinion, based on experiences from other natural resources co-management projects in Thailand, that the process of involving communities in decision making and planning on district, provincial and sector level needs, in order to succeed or have any lasting impact, requires a longer time-frame and larger budget than this project has received.

#### *Integration of the CCA into Provincial Development Plan*

Despite good local contacts and the cooperation that SDF and its local NGO partners have had over a rather long period of time, as well as the establishment of the Provincial Committee by the effort of TRCS12, the integration of community climate change development and action plans into the provincial development plan has not yet been accomplished, and is still on-going at the time of the MTR team's visit in May 2013.

The main obstacle for the integration of the CCA into Provincial Development Plan is due to centralized government and administrative structure. So long as the development plan at provincial level is entirely under the authority of the governor, there is an uncertainty over the interest of the governor to integrate the CCA into the provincial development plan. Moreover, there is a great uncertainty on the change of the governor contributing to the difficulty to integrate CCA into provincial development plan. The change of governor will affect the Provincial Development Plan as the plan is under supreme authority of the governor.

#### *Integration of the CCA into Sector policies*

There is a possibility for the CCA to integrate into sector policies, particularly at the line department at local levels, although it might take time for the integration. During the field visit, the MTR had the opportunity to interview local officers from the Irrigation Department in Pattalung and the Mangrove section of DMCR in Nakorn-si-Thammarat in relation to the possibility that the CCA be integrated into their policy at local level. They expressed willingness to work with communities in joint management CC risk reduction activities and continue some of the activities initiated by the project, i.e. ecosystem approach in watershed management in Jong Thanon sub-district and the work on alternative livelihoods and food security measures from mangrove rehabilitation in Leam Talumphuk. The fact is that some communities have – either on their own initiative or through project support – assisted the line agencies in the activities such as conserving natural resources and protecting watersheds and shorelines in their areas through re-establishment of small areas of mangrove forest, mixed rubber plantations/protection of

sea-grass, coral reefs areas and through patrolling activities; however, actual participation in the management planning process, including decision making, has not yet taken place.

Another example of the reluctance for engaging the community and NGOs in the policy set up is reflected in the interview with the government line agency in that they have shown their appreciation to the effort made by the project, but politely indicated that they to some extent already had CC risks included in their management and development plans. For instance, ONEP staff explained that a 38 year national Master Plan for CC is in the approval process by the cabinet and that NGO opinions/contributions have already been included in it. They also commented that it would have been a better approach by the project if an overall CC risk reduction plan covering the whole district/sub-district had been presented to the provincial administration, and not single community plans/proposals.

Outcome 4: Project knowledge captured, disseminated and replicated through dedicated follow-up activities

A project newsletter was published quarterly during 2012 in Nakorn-si-Thammarat disseminating project information on pilot site activities to key stakeholders and the general public. Preparation of training modules to be proposed for the DDPM academy and TRCS Nurse College is under way. A Climate Change adaptation webpage was established in early 2012 on the TRCS website with updates of project knowledge followed by a project website that has been or is intended to be linked to other partner websites including TRCS, SDF, SEA-START and DDPM. However, the process appears to have been at a stand- still for a while, with a lack of updating and maintenance of the website and its links.

Some project meetings have been used as a channel to communicate the project activities to key project stakeholders, including MONRE, and knowledge exchange from field visits has been conducted between and within target communities mainly in Trang and Pattalung provinces, but the dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned appear otherwise to have been delayed or given a rather low priority by the PMU.

According to the project management, during the remaining 6-8 months the project will focus on preparing and producing at least one knowledge and lessons learned document in Thai and English and conduct a national forum, where project knowledge gained and lessons learned will be discussed and documented.

*Table 3: Summary of Project Implementation*

Outcomes	Rating
Outcome 1: Increased knowledge and awareness of climate-related risks	S

and impacts in vulnerable coastal communities	
Output 1.1: Climate change vulnerabilities and adaptation options of 10 target communities systematically analyzed and documented through participatory and gender-sensitive climate change Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCA)	S
Output 1.2: Key public service providers and decision-makers at the sub-district and village levels have increased ability to integrate climate risk reduction and community-based adaptation into coastal development planning	MS
Output 1.3: Priority community climate risk reduction (CRR) Proposals integrated into Community Development Plans and submitted for approval and financing by sub-district government	U
Output 1.4: Increased TRCS and DDPM capacity for integrating climate change risks into DRM planning and practice	U
Outcome 2; Increased climate risk management and disaster preparedness capacity in vulnerable coastal communities	S
Output 2.1: Up to 10 small-scale adaptation grants provided to target communities to demonstrate priority climate risk reduction measures identified in their Climate Risk Reduction Action Plans	MS
Output 2.2: The effectiveness and adaptation potential of at least 2 community-based adaptation measures in target coastal sub-districts systematically assessed	S
<i>Outcome 3</i> : Integration of climate change adaptation into provincial development plans and sector policies	U
Output 3.1: Priority community climate risk reduction proposals submitted for provincial government approval and financing	U
Output 3.2: Provincial decision-makers, planners and line ministry staff in 3 target provinces understand climate change risks and know how to integrate climate risk reduction measures into coastal development planning:	MS
Output 3.3: Recommendations for strengthening coastal climate risk reduction and community-based adaptation developed and discussed with provincial decision-makers	MS
Outcome 4: Project knowledge captured, disseminated and replicated through dedicated follow-up activities	U

Output 4.1: Project knowledge and lessons learned systematically analyzed and documented	U
Output 4.2: Increased awareness of climate change risks and community-based adaptation options and experiences among coastal communities in Thailand	U
Output 4.3: Project knowledge and lessons learned disseminated nationally through websites, adaptation networks, the media and public events	MS

### 2.3. Project Results:

#### Nakorn-si-Thammarat Province

TRCS 12 is responsible for the implementation in 3 communities in Leam Talumpuk and 1 village (Moo 5) in Nai Thung sub-district at Thasala. The TRCS12 was successful in establishing a Provincial Committee (Nov 2011), which was appointed by the Provincial Governor, with the role and mandate to provide guidance for the implementation and approval of VCAs and small grant proposals.

According to the VCA, it is obvious that storms and coastal erosion are the main problems for the targeted coastal communities in this area. Ten small grant proposals have been submitted to the provincial committee of which seven grant activities have been approved whilst three proposals have not yet been approved. The seven approved small grant activities are:

- CBDRM training,
- Mud dredging along coastlines (incl. establishment of mangrove plantings),
- Lifejacket production and enterprise training (2 communities),
- Erection of village level early warning towers and sirens (incl. community training)(2 communities), and
- Alternative livelihoods and food security measures from mangrove rehabilitation

Three proposals are dredging waterways for evacuation of boats during storms, as the Provincial Committee suggested that all the proposals involving mud-dredging need to include a plan on how to address the mud accumulation/erosion in the long run. All in all, the proposals on mud dredging need to get approval from responsible agencies (e.g. Port Authority and the DNP).

Local technical support/consultancy to grant activities has been provided and monitoring and distribution mechanisms have been established in mid-2012. Coordination with local institutions such as Walailak University to supply technical knowledge to pilot sites was

also arranged. However, the technical input was a one-off event and technical back-stopping together with M&E have not been sufficiently maintained.

In addition, SEA-START also provided assistance to channel the budget for small grant activities. This is because of a TRCS regulation whereby they are not allowed to transfer the budget directly to the targeted communities. Nevertheless, it appears as if the budget distribution mechanism initiated by TRCS and distributed to the communities by SEA-START has been delayed.

During the field visit, the MTR – accompanied by the TRCS project field staff – held discussions and meetings with representatives from appointed Provincial Committee, DMCR’s local mangrove section, head of TRCS12 regional office based in Nakorn-si-Thammarat, and community groups from Thasala and Laem Talumphuk sub-district. Discussions were mainly on three small grant activities: a) lifejacket production and enterprise training, b) mud dredging along coastlines and c) alternative livelihoods and food security measures from mangrove rehabilitation. Two of the five small grant activities were visited in the field: a) mud dredging along coastlines and planting of mangrove specie(s) and b) alternative livelihoods and food security measures from mangrove rehabilitation.

The progress of all five activities has been thoroughly discussed in the meetings with above mentioned community groups and organizations. The following are the observations from the MTR site visit.

1. The life jacket production and enterprise training in two community groups is still on-going. However, the MTR sees that the activity cannot be sustained due to the fact that there is no potential market for locally made life jackets.
2. Erection of village level early warning towers and sirens in Leam Talumphuk sub-district is useful for the villages though it is not directly linked to the CCA – but rather linked to disaster warning purposes.
3. Community training in CBDRM (warning and evacuation drills) in Bang Nai Thung village in Thasala sub-district, which was approved by Provincial Committee, was rescheduled to sometime later this year.
4. The coastline mud dredging is far from complete, and the project should now discuss how to dispose of the unused budget allocation during the remaining period. It could be used to further attempt the re-establishment of mangrove plantations along the coastline. The project activity to plant mangrove seedlings in the mud has probably not succeeded due to the use of only one species of mangrove and planting during a very hot and dry period; insect attacks and the dry conditions have killed most plants. It is, however, important to continue this effort to protect the coastline in a natural way, and it is hoped that DMCR will do this.



5. The visit to a mangrove rehabilitation activity with two communities in Leam Talumphuk arranged by DMCR showed a very promising CCA activity. This includes the potential for a diverse alternative livelihood by focusing on planting and sustainable use of Nipa palm in degraded mangrove areas. The planting of Nipa palm in such areas will create a positive impact in Leam Talumpuk sub-district – both generating additional income and at the same time protecting from CC created risks (floods and storms).
6. It is important to note that from the MTR’s findings, the mud dredging activity at Thasala sub-district is a controversial issue as it is uncertain that the activity can be completed within the time frame due to the low level of cooperation among community members; despite the fact that community members regarded the activity as useful for them, they have shown no willingness to cooperate in the activity. Significantly, and unfortunately, only one community member turned up for the arranged meeting.

### Pattalung Province

SDF is responsible for the field implementation with 3 local NGOs (Foundation of Reclaiming Rural Agriculture and Food sovereignty Action (RRAFA), Sustainable Agricultural Network (SAN) and Thai Sea Watch Association as local partners. Some technical consultancy input from Songkla University and Pattalung Rice Research Center has also been a part of the implementation.

Flooding and drought are regarded by the communities, and confirmed by the VCA report from SEA-START, as the main effects from climate change compounded by forest degradation in the watershed areas and replacement of the natural waterways with construction of irrigation canals. The activities of the project – under the small grant scheme – are responding to these problems. These activities include:

- Forest and watershed management (upstream) to mitigate the risks of floods;
- Climate resilient/alternative rice production techniques, incl. conserving (rice-bank) and testing flood resilient old rice varieties (midstream);
- Mangrove plantations along the shoreline of Songkla Lake (downstream);
- Establishment of a fishing gear revolving fund (downstream); and
- Improved radio network that connects upstream and downstream villages to mitigate the impacts of flash floods (the entire river basin).

SDF facilitated the discussions through the area-based committee and came up with community plans to undertake activities to increase their adaptive capacities. SDF has implemented the activities through their local NGO partners with the use of ecosystem management approach focusing on upstream, midstream and downstream. This approach is relatively relevant for addressing mitigation of flooding, landslide and drought risks.

There was also a strong commitment from communities and local government, expressed during meetings and interviews in the province.

During the site visit, the MTR team had meetings and discussions with community groups, district and provincial officers, partner-NGOs and staff from relevant line agencies, i.e. Irrigation department and DNP. During these meetings, three activities, namely Mangrove plantations along Songkla Lake shoreline, Establishment of fishing gear revolving fund and Improvement of radio network connecting upstream and downstream villages to mitigate flash floods, were partly presented and discussed.

The MTR team was also shown sites where promising mixed rubber plantations or forest gardens are being established by members of the project community group. Rows of different high value species fruit trees from the natural forest have increased biodiversity and resilience to CC. In the first years of establishment, agricultural crops and herbs can be grown in between the tree rows.

The five activities under the small grant budget are all near completion or completed and the grant budget used. Some of them - i.e. fishing gear revolving funds, climate resilient rice production, watershed forest management, and the radio network - appear to have potential to be sustained beyond the project duration; with the help of the strong NGOs involved in the Jong Thanon community, this is hopefully possible. There are consequently two main observations, which MTR would like to highlight for future intervention in this area:

1. *Forest and watershed management to mitigate the risk of floods.* The activity consisted of rubber plantations-inter-planted with different fruit tree species and other plant species from the natural forest. These biodiversity rich plantations appeared to be successfully established.
2. *Climate resilient/alternative rice production techniques developed and tested with technical advice from the Pattalung Rice Research Center.* The MTR visited a site where tests of flood and draft resilient old rice varieties and new planting techniques are conducted. This activity looks promising and is also very important internationally. In relation to this, it is worth noting that it has been reported in the media recently that the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), who has worked with the development of flood resilient rice varieties (hybrids), has informed that a promising hybrid variety has been made and tested, but that it will take approximately 5 years before it is ready for marketing. The climate resilient rice production grant activity should – like the mixed rubber plantations/forest gardens – be given more attention as a case study for production of the proposed best practice to be disseminated under Outcome 4.

## Trang Province

SDF, with local partner NGO “Save Andaman Network,” have been the main responsible partners of key activities in three communities on the islands of Koh Libong and Koh Mook and in Mod Tanoi district. These targeted areas belong to the Katang Bay ecosystem, under the jurisdiction of the Kantang Bay district and located in two protected areas. A small team composed of staff from “Save Andaman Network” has performed the “bridging” role that connects government and communities.

According to the VCA, landslides caused by storms and heavy rain, coastal erosion and flooding in coastal villages, shortage of natural marine resources (i.e. fish and crab stocks) and reduced underground freshwater quality and supply are the common CC problems in these three communities, although it cannot be proven whether these are due to the impact of development or CC. However, the MTR believes that it may be the combination of the impact from both development activity and CC, particularly with the shortage of natural marine resources and reduced underground freshwater supply.

The small grant activities in Trang have been under implementation with most of them initiated and some completed by the end of 2012. The designed activities to respond to the CCA are as follows:

- Strengthening traditional fishing techniques,
- Improving local radio network ,
- Community land use planning,
- Promotion of alternative livelihood through income generation,
- Water conservation through mixed rubber plantations, and
- Shoreline protection.

The community on Koh Libong had implemented activities under the small grant scheme. These include a) Promotion of alternative livelihood (ecotourism) and b) Preservation of watershed/forest to mitigate risks of floods. On Koh Mook, community groups have worked on a) Promotion of alternative livelihood /ecotourism and establishment of crab banks and b) Water conservation and catchment techniques, including check dams. The targeted coastal community in Mod Tanoi is working with a) Promotion of alternative livelihood through income generation (coffee and rice), b) Shoreline protection and c) Land use planning.

MTR, together with field management staff, visited sites where small grant activities are being implemented, holding discussions and interviews with representatives of the communities which included a women’s group and the radio network group. It is the impression that most activities are well underway to strengthen community awareness and CC adaptation measures.

The potential for development of alternative livelihood activities is limited particularly on both islands due to the fact that they are located in protected areas under DNP management, causing conflicts to have eventually occurred. For instance, the conflict on Koh Mook is over the land right between Had Chao Mai NP and the community on the island. Most of the community dwellers were already settled there prior to the official announcement of the National Park. The dwellers have a right to stay in the area if they can prove they were there before and provided they do not expand their settlements and agricultural fields. The conflicts have been on-going for more than a decade and mainly concern establishment of some rubber plantations that the NP claims are on land that had been natural forest when the park was established. The strict National Park and Wildlife Conservation Acts limit any alternative livelihood activity the community can do on and around the islands and the coastline.

The following are some of the observations on the activities that MTR have had during the site visit.

1. The activity on establishing mixed rubber plantations (mostly vegetables growing between rows of rubber trees) on degraded areas is directly responding to the CC for the purpose of the preservation of watershed/ forest to mitigate risks of floods.
2. The MTR sees the significance of the activity on “Strengthening traditional fishing techniques” of which the main purpose appears to be to mitigate the devastating effects on fish stocks, sea grass and coral reefs from large scale outside trawler fishing techniques (net dragging on the ocean bottom) by using the coastal communities’ traditional fishing techniques. It is hoped by the communities and the related NGOs that the Fishery Department and DMCR will in the near future work on the establishment of special sea zones, where only the traditional fishing techniques and gear are allowed to be used. This is in order to allow damaged coral reefs and seaweed areas to regenerate for both the benefit of alternative livelihood activities and CC risk reduction.
3. It is important to note that the meeting with the radio network group was organized during the mission although the MTR noticed that the radio network activity, which was involved not only in targeted communities but also across the whole province, appears to be making a good contribution to CC preparedness. The network is a volunteer group working with warning and helping communities that are under threat from flooding, storms, landslides etc. They follow the metrological department’s weather forecasts, and warn communities in the province and region (by radio contact) about upcoming climate disasters. They had been doing this several years before the project started, and they have received a small budget/donation from the SDF managed small grant fund to support their work.

*Table 4: Summary of Project Result*

Project Intervention Results at site level	Rating
Nakorn-si-Thammarat	S
Pattalung	HS
Trang	HS
Overall	S

#### **2.4. Project Management:**

The project is being executed by the Thai Red Cross Societies (TRCS). The Deputy Director of TRCS-RCHB is the Project Director. A Project Management Unit (PMU) - based at TRCS in Bangkok, constituted by a National Project Manager (NPM), an Administrative Assistant and Financial Assistant, provides coordination and oversight of the project. Field Officers have been hired to support the implementation of the project activities for TRCS12 in Nakorn-si-Thamarat province. SDF is responsible for the implementation of the activities in Pattalung and Trang provinces, while SEA-START is responsible for providing the technical input and backstopping for the project.

The Project Board (PB) is responsible for making executive management decisions for the project and for providing guidance to the PMU when needed. The PB provides overall guidance and direction to the project, and is also responsible for making decisions on a consensus basis when high-level strategic guidance is required, including the approval of major revisions in project strategy or implementation approach. The Project Board approves appointment and responsibilities of the National Project Manager (NPM) and annual work plan (AWP). The PB consists of:

- TRCS Secretary General (Advisory)
- UNDP Representative Advisory
- Director, DDPM Advisory
- Director TRCS-RCHB Co-Chairs
- MNRE, Secretary Member
- Director, SEA-START Member
- Provincial Governor, Nakorn-si-Thammarat Member
- Provincial Governor, Trang Member
- Provincial Governor, Pattalung Member
- Director, SDF Member
- Director, Thai Red Cross College of Nursing Member
- Deputy Director, TRCS-RCHB Member and Secretary
- Director, Research and International Cooperation Bureau, DDPM Member and

- Assistant Secretary
- Head, RCHB Nursing Member and Assistant Secretary

Technically, there are also 4 Working Committees (also stated in the Project Document as the Technical Advisory Group) established to provide technical advice and backstopping both at national and site levels. These are 1) Risk Analysis and Capacity Building Working Committees, 2) Community-Based Adaptation Working Committees, 3) Policy Analysis and Revising Working Committees and 4) Knowledge Management, Learning and Dissemination Working Committees.

The project reports directly to the Project Director, who supervises the PMU and overall project activities. In Nakorn-si-Thammarat, there is a Provincial Committee appointed by the Governor consisting of representatives from government line agencies, local government (TAO), local universities, and communities to serve as advisory board with the mandate to supervise the process of VCA as well as approve the small grant proposals and monitor the progress of the activities. In Trang and Pattalung, informal area-based committees were established to serve as an advisory body at site level to improve networking between the different stakeholders.

The design of the management structure has proved to be useful. The overall management has been to some extent effective and has demonstrated ability to adapt to changes and to meet new challenges (i.e. the delays caused by the complicated budget distribution system, the resignation of first project manager etc.). Project management structures appear to have facilitated inter-agency cooperation to some level. However, the following issues resulting from the management remain:

- Key stakeholders' involvement in the project appears to be limited to only TRCS and SDF; this is an opportunity lost, as closer involvement of local NGOs and communities is limited to site level. Their involvement could thus have been more beneficial and more effective during the implementation had they also been involved in management at other levels. The MTR has the impression that many planning activities at project sites might have required more project support, particularly technical support and backstopping, to ensure effective adaptive management.
- Technical input and backstopping prove to be the major constraint of the management. According to the management set up, SEA-START is appointed as supplier – and also member of the Project Board – to provide technical input and backstopping, particularly on climate change related scientific data and information and other technical support on adaptation technique issues – despite the fact that the input provided by SEA-START have resulted mainly in mapping and scenario analysis. At site levels, it appears that there is no systematic mechanism for providing technical input and backstopping; instead, local

consultants have been recruited to provide technical input based on their expertise. In this respect, the MTR finds that the Project Management Unit (PMU) should have been strengthened and that a full-time Technical Advisor (TA) should have been an option to fill-in the technical gap and give assurance that the technical input and backstopping for activities at the project sites are in line with the adaptive management approach.

#### The role of PMU

It is indicated in the Project Document that, the PMU, through the leadership of National Project Manager (NPM), is responsible for the day-to-day management, administration, coordination, and technical supervision of project implementation. The NPM is working closely with the Technical Support Teams and provides management oversight to the field coordinators and assistants hired through the project. The PMU established for this project, consisting of the NPM with the support from a full-time Finance & Administrative Assistant staff, is regarded as an *ad hoc* unit to the existing TRCS management structure. As an ad hoc unit, the PMU has spent most of the time solving internal management problems to ensure that the project keeps pace. However, there is a necessity for the PMU, and the NPM in particular, to spend more time in the field in order to assist in backstopping and ensure the coordination, as well as increase the communication with other stakeholders and partners in the project both at central and site levels. The lack of coordination and effective communication together with the lack of technical backstopping are among the reasons that the PMU has had problems in improving the project achievements and strengthening impacts as a whole.

#### The use of Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

Although the Project Document envisages the establishment of four TAGs with the role to provide regular technical oversight and backstopping to the field-based Technical Support Teams (TST), including assistance in overcoming technical problems affecting the delivery of project results, in reality, no such a group was established. It is not clear to the MTR why there was no active role of the TAGs in the implementation. However, it can be assumed that there would be a difficulty in gathering the members of the TAGs to provide such technical backstopping and input, as they only represented the line agency and were not strongly involved in the project

All in all, the MTR regards the design for having TAG as a useful part of the project only if the project knows how to make use of this mechanism. It is surely a lost opportunity for ensuring technical backstopping at all levels. From the in-depth discussion, the TST also expressed their concern over the lack of technical backstopping from the TAG (Working Committee) as well as on the role of PMU in providing the technical backstopping.

There also seem to be opportunities lost in the policy advocacy at all levels. The TAG could also have played an important role in policy advocacy at the provincial and national levels. The TAG would also have the function of ensuring the flow of project information and lessons learned to the Integrated Provincial Administration Committees of the target provinces as well as to key national policy and decision-makers within MONRE, including ONEP, the NCCC, MOI and other key agencies, committees, departments and research institutions.

Financial Management:

TRCS’s complicated financial structure and procedure has caused delays in reimbursement for the project as a whole. Although there have been a number of efforts to improve the disbursement process and procedure, the MTR has the impression that the organization’s financial structures and procedures are the main obstacle in the release of funds. This is hard to improve within the project period.

Nevertheless, from the project management and project assurance points of view, the project has had an effective mechanism to disburse the funding during the first 2 years, as indicated in the audit report. Use of GEF funding has been efficient throughout the project. By the end of 2012, the project had spent around USD 538,051 or 62% of the total project budget of USD 869,091. Relative to the budget that has actually been implemented, the project has achieved reasonable progress in Outcome 1 on awareness raising and the development of VCA (83%), and in Outcome 2 with regards to community capacity development in CCA (76%). There are overall delays in both budget implementation and delivery of activities with regards to Outcome 3 to integrate CCA in the Provincial Development Plan and line agency policies (23%); and in Outcome 4 on capturing knowledge and lessons learned in general (17%).

*Table 5 Project Expenditures*

Outcome	Total budget as per outcome (USD)	2011 Final Expenditure (USD)	2012 Final Expenditure (USD)	Total Expenditure USD	Percentage %
Outcome 1	172,125.00	98,910.03	45,051.44	143,961.47	83.63
Outcome 2	356,125.00	59,828	214,306.61	274,134.61	76.97
Outcome 3	105,316.00	0	24,455.65	24,455.65	23.22
Outcome 4	104,625.00	10,601.50	7,284.00	17,885.50	17.09
Outcome 5	44,000.00	23,817.85		23,817.85	54.13



Outcome 6	86,900.00	7,535.99	46,260.15	53,796.14	61.90
Total	869,091.00	200,693.37	337,357.85	538,051.22	61.90

The project has thus, despite its constraints in financial procedures, managed to maintain a good delivery rate, thanks mainly to the strong managerial skills of the project management unit. However this is also, as indicated earlier, at the expense of other aspects of the project, as the PMU team has to constantly spend a lot of time and energy trying to get the financial matters resolved, instead of looking more into the M&E process as well as providing technical backstopping as the project evolves.

*Table 6: Summary of Project Management issues*

Key Issue in Project Design	Rating
The Role of PMU	MS
The use of Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs)	U
Financial Management	MS
Overall project management	MS

## **2.5. Conclusions and summary of findings:**

Overall efficiency has been satisfactory. The project has suffered from the financial procedure, with delays in budget execution. Results have been achieved with the budget that has been implemented, in particular under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2.

In term of effectiveness, the project has satisfied in delivery of Outcome 1 contributing to the increasing of CCA awareness and knowledge through the VCA process. It has also been effective in delivery of certain activities under Outcome 2 on community-based adaptation measures leading to the capacity of community to implement small grant activities. There have been constraints in the overall achievement of Outcome 3 and, in particular, delays in the implementation of outcome 4. Effectiveness is therefore evaluated as marginally satisfactory.

The project has had some impact, including in terms of increasing cooperation at local levels. The project has, in particular through activities in applying ecosystem for CCA activities done by SDF in Pattalung province, shown that “*things can be done differently*”. The project has the effort to integrate the CCA into development plans and policies at both provincial and local levels though it takes longer time for this achievement and it may not be seen within the project.

Finally, sustainability is deemed marginally satisfactory. Capacity has been increased within targeted communities to a certain degree, and there is willingness from government line agencies at local to adopt the activities into planning, but more mainstreaming into sectorial departments is required. The project has been weak in building capacity of TRCS and DDPM in general. Activities in Pattalung and Trang provinces are likely to be sustained following the project, whilst some activities in Nakorn-si-Thammrat require more inputs as to be sustainable.

*Table 7: Summary of Findings*

Key Criteria	Rating
Effectiveness	MS
Efficiency	S
Impacts	MS
Sustainability	MS

### **3. LESSONS LEARNED, RECOMMENDATIONS AND EXIT STRATEGY**

#### **3.1. Lessons Learned:**

It is important to note that it may be premature for the MTR to come up with detailed Lessons Learned at this stage, as the project is in the middle of its implementation. However, the MTR would like to raise the following issues, which it sees as lessons learned from the project.

#### Management of project partners

Working with people and bringing communities into the adaptive planning and management decision is a long-time process which requires a longer time-frame and a larger budget than the INCA project is designed with. The rather unique design with several partners (e.g. TRCS, SDF, DDPM and SEA-START) instead of single implementer appears to have created a lack of clear delegation, responsibility and communication. To efficiently manage the CC project with many partners, production of a procedures manual that clearly outlines the procedures (incl. financial procedures) to be followed and the functions and responsibilities of different elements of the set up (e.g. committees, partners, PMU, field teams etc.) is essential for the management.

#### Use of scientific data and information in the CCA planning

Climate Change is a complex issue, and it requires a high level of understanding. The VCA is a useful analytical tool for facilitating understanding of the risks and impact of

climate change to vulnerable communities; VCA is also used for identifying the measurement for CCA purposes. In order to have a better understanding of the CC issues, a wide range of scientific data and information for the analysis is required. Effective use of scientific data and information in the process of CCA development will ensure the validity of the CCA activity.

### Adequate technical guidance for CCA

Climate change, its likely impacts and how this will affect livelihoods, is a complex science. Explaining and understanding climate change requires adequate technical expertise in order to raise awareness – whether for individuals or for communities. Integrating adaptation into the planning and implementation of project activities requires adequate technical understanding.

The project's approach of relying on only one source of technical support – namely SEA-START –, is fundamentally weak, as the CCA requires a range of technical input. There are other technical aspects which required expertise from institutions, line agencies and other relevant institutions for advice on the implementation of CCA approaches, policies, knowledge management and other issues.

Lack of systematic planning and design on technical inputs may result in 'doing the wrong thing right'. Given the wealth of expertise in all these domains, the project should seek adequate technical expertise for on-the ground activities that move beyond business-as-usual development and specifically focus on climate change adaptation.

### **3.2. Recommendations:**

#### Outcome 1:

- For the future use of VCA, the standard needs to be set for the development of VCA to be used for the CCA planning. The approach and methodology of developing the VCA should make use of related scientific data and information for in-depth analysis of CC impacts at site level.
- Preparation of a Handbook and general guideline on VCA could also be useful for future similar CCA projects.
- It is also recommended that the final summing up workshop with participation from all involved stakeholders should be arranged where the VCA procedures (incl. improvements) and integration of CC risks into DRM planning and practice are discussed

#### Outcome 2:

- It is recommended to focus on a few numbers of the most successful small grant activities (listed earlier in the report) to ensure the sustainability of the activities,

and that they respond primarily to the effects of climate change and ensure that on-going activities will be sustainable at community level.

- The approach and methodology used by TRCS and SDF for the implementation of the small grant activities has merit, despite the fact that it is different in its perspectives. It is worthwhile to document both approaches and methodologies as lessons learned in detail.

#### Outcome 3:

- There should be a continuation of the efforts to integrate CCA plans into provincial and sector level by completing the remaining activities.
- A summing-up workshop with participation of key stakeholders from all levels should be arranged to discuss the achievements and results of the process and the possibilities and future approach of integrating the CCA plans.
- There is a possibility for the integration of the activity at local policy level (e.g. DMCR, Irrigation Department, TAO, etc.); therefore, it is recommended that the project holds a discussion with the relevant potential agency at local level to consider the possibility of handing over the activity for its continuation after the project has ended. This is to ensure the sustainability of the activities.

#### Outcome 4:

- Any available budget is used for the development of IEC (Information, Education and Communication) materials to present best case stories and lessons learned from the project. It is recommended that the PMU together with partner organizations select three successful case stories from each provincial site intervention (i.e. the coastal management in Trang, the rice production in Pattalung, and the Nipa Palm rehabilitation in Nakorn-si-Thammarat).
- A consultant team (preferably with a journalist background) is hired to facilitate the process of writing up the best practice (case stories) as well as a video production to be developed using the 3 selected cases, and to be presented for PR purposes.

### **3.3. Exit Strategy:**

The MTR is being conducted only 8 months before the project ends, and the possibility of extending the project and finding additional funds for a second phase is small. The recommendations from the MTR will therefore focus on an exit strategy that includes potentials and possibilities to sustain some of the most successful and/or important activities and achievements. This includes the partnership and strategic network, follow up of promising small grant activities, and continuation of the long time process of integrating the climate change adaptation approach into development planning.

An exit strategy is needed that involves closer cooperation with the relevant line departments, universities, research stations and the project's own field staff in order:

- To link the information and the knowledge products of the project to the training curriculum of the DDPM college and TRCS Nursing College. This is also seen by the project's core team as a possibility to sustain at least some of the lessons learned and knowledge produced by the project.
- To complete activities for Outcome 4 by employing Information and knowledge distribution consultant(s) to compile lessons learned and knowledge gained by the project in one document and/or hiring a publication company to produce an easy booklet and a video about the most successful project activities(case studies) with lessons learned and knowledge gained from them.
- To focus on (select, develop and sustain) some of the most successful/relevant small grant activities in each province. This includes:
  - Following up the mixed rubber plantation activity by establishing more biodiversity-rich and resilient “forest gardens” with variety of economic plants such as teak, fruit trees, coffee and cocoa and natural vegetation (good examples can already be seen in the small grant activity in Pattalung province);
  - Conducting a feasibility study and expanding, in cooperation with DMCR (mangrove section) in Nakorn-si-Thammarat province, to other communities, the successful planting of Nipa palm in degraded mangrove areas and the development of Nipa palm productions for the purpose of creating additional community income generation;
  - Strengthening the conservation activities done by the communities in three provinces to some coastal zone areas and the 2 marine protected areas, and including these activities (if not already done) in the PAs own conservation planning;
  - Conducting an end of project forum (i.e. symposium) for dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned by using IEC materials developed to be disseminated to the general public.