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**Context**

The Kuan Kreng landscape (KKL) contains Thailand’s second largest peat swamp forest area. These provide many ecosystem services, including providing livelihoods for local communities, providing natural hydrological regulation, storing a large quantity of carbon, and harboring significant biodiversity. These ecosystem services are at risk from unsustainable activities, especially conversion to oil palm cultivation and associated drainage and forest fires.

To address these risks, the project identified a need to shift from unsustainable land-use policies and practices to sustainable land and forest management that could be enforced and adopted at a landscape level. The project document identified three barriers to achieving this shift and established a project strategy based around addressing these barriers.

The project objective is “To conserve and restore peatlands to increase their capacities to act as carbon sinks, as habitats for globally important species, and as sources of ecosystem services for improved livelihoods”.

Outcome 1 is “Expanding protection of high conservation value peat swamp forests and demonstrating their sustainable use within the broader landscape” and focuses on: (i) bringing the entire KKL under protected areas, and (ii) improving the management effectiveness of these existing and new protected zones.

Outcome 2 is “Implementing technologies to avoid peat swamp forest degradation and restore degraded peat swamp forests”. It focuses on modelling and implementation of hydrotechnical measures to manage water levels in an area of 4,600 ha in the KKL, which will contribute to improved health of peat swamp ecosystems and help reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from mineralizing peat and fires. This outcome also includes activities to reforest peat swamp forests that have been damaged by fire and storms in the Kreng sub-district.

Outcome 3 is “Improving policies, standards and enforcement mechanisms for conservation and sustainable use of peat swamp forests” and focuses on creating an enabling environment for a landscape approach to management of peat swamp areas. The outcome will result in a national inventory of peat swamps and a National Strategy for Peat Swamps.

**Recommendation and management response**

The TE team made twenty-two (22) recommendations for improvement and continuity. Of these, eleven (11) are fully accepted, seven (7) are partially accepted and four (4) are rejected. Actions to implement recommendations are detailed in this management response.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A1.** Water management - Further apply the MIKE SHE Model for real testing of water management so as to generate real “lessons learned” among related agencies and to provide practice for application in other peat swamp areas. RID should take the lead on this, but ONEP needs to propose it via a relevant policy body such as the Wetland Sub-Committee, then the Environment Committee (and if necessary, cabinet) to endorse and order the RID under the Ministry of Agriculture to take action. | | | | |
| **Management response:[[1]](#footnote-1)** Partially accepted. The water modelling is not a regular function of the RID. The RID usually contracts consulting firms to run water model (water balance and hydrological model) when it comes to the particular infrastructure investment projects. So, it is hard to give leading role on dissemination of the MIKE SHE lessons learned to the RID. Rather, the Department of Water Resource (DWR) is mandated on water management focusing on research, technology, management. In 2020, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE) has transferred the Wetland Management’ responsibility from ONEP to DWR. The DWR has contracted the 2.6 Million USD to a consulting firm to continue management of Kuan Kreng Peat Swamp. This project duration is one year (from when to when). | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[2]](#footnote-2)** | |
| **Comments** | **Status[[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| Share data and information of the MIKE SHE model to relevant organizations. | April – December 2021 | DWR, RID |  | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A2. Carbon monitoring – Support a critical technical review of the project-supported methodologies and results on carbon monitoring** in order to provide recommendations for their application in measuring and reporting on GHG emissions and carbon sequestration for peat swamps and other habitat types under the UNFCCC National Determined Contributions. The methodologies need to be workable for practical government monitoring and reporting procedures. | | | | |
| **Management response:** Partially accepted. The current methodology is costly and sophisticated. It is suitable for the university’s R&D work. Also, there is no standardized Monitoring, Verification and Reporting (MRV) for carbon sequestration in Peat Swamp. This research work remains to be done by relevant technical agencies. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 2.1 Consult Dr. Sapit who is researcher of this project component to guide further action on how to take the Peat Swamp carbon sink capacity into an account of NDC. | April – Dec 2021 | Kasersart University, Climate Change Coordination Division of ONEP , UNDP |  | Initiated |
| 2.2 Monitoring of the community network that was trained on a simple methodology for carbon sink measurement. | April – Dec 2021 | Kasersart University, Climate Change Coordination Division of ONEP, UNDP |  | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 3.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A.3** Strengthen the sustainability of livelihoods and expand the network to Thale Noi and Songkhla Lake area**s**: Continued capacity development and networking support is needed to increase the environmental sustainability of livelihoods in KKL (krajood production, and also other livelihoods). In addition, stimulation of local involvement should be supported by TEI post-project through the new grant funding received via UNDP CO. TEI should also support expansion of the network to Thale Noi and Songkhla Lake areas through a consultative platform which links local people from the Khuan Kreng area upstream, with Thale Noi (midstream), and Songkhla lake (downstream) to learn from the project’s work. Local people with different occupations apart from Krajood production should be invited to join. | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accepted. With additional funding from UNDP project, TEI has just received a Low Value Grant to support social and economic recovery of the communities in KKL which are affected by COVID19. | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | |
| **Comments** | **Status** | |
| Monitor work progress from TEI funded by the JSB’s Low Value Grant. | | April-Dec 2021; longer if funding available | | UNDP CO/TEI | |  | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 4.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A.4** Link ongoing peat swamp management activities in KKL area to the GCF readiness support project. A UNDP/ONEP GCF project has been developed that includes NST and Songkhla, providing the opportunity to follow up on climate change adaptation measures in the KKL. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully Accepted. Peat Swamp Forest restoration and projection is a nature-based solution for climate actions. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| 4.1 UNDP GCF project team will include peat swamp management as one of the nature-based solutions for developing a NAP measure. | April-Dec 2021 / longer if GCF supports | | Climate Change Coordination Division, ONEP/UNDP | | Climate Change Coordination Department, ONEP is the implementing partner of the GCF NAP Marine project. | | | Initiated | |
| 4.2 UNDP GCF team will coordinate with the consulting firm that is running the project for DWR. | April-Dec 2021 / longer if GCF supports | | Climate Change Coordination Division, ONEP/UNDP | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 5.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A5. Test the integrated landscape approach linking climate change and biodiversity through the Innovation Accelerator Policy Lab.**  The integrated landscape approach requires effective coordination mechanism, cross-functional management, joint plan, budget, and KPI. These are still quite challenging for the Thai government, therefore, UNDP can take this opportunity to propel the issue further through the UNDP policy lab which could help the government to explore ways and means to foster their integrated operation in particular areas such as  KKL. Thailand was selected as a target country by UNDP global to implement an **Innovation Accelerator Policy Lab, which is** also a Thai government initiative with the National Socio-economic Development Council as a donor. The aim is to test public policy innovations (not technologies) – the PSE issue could be one such public policy to test – linking CCM and Biodiversity, which is a policy gap at present. This would be a good example to show how the two thematic areas are mutually interdependent. A sustainable tourism test case is currently in progress. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully Accepted. The maximize carbon sink capacity for peat swamp management should be listed as a priority issue of the SDGs Accelerator Lab and Thailand Policy Lab. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The Acc Lab team will discuss this recommendation with the Innovation Acc Policy team andNESDC. | April-Dec 2021 / longer if funding available | | UNDP, ONEP | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 6.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A6. Locate additional external funding to support the sustainability of project outcomes:** UNDP’s Rapid Financing Facility offers another potential avenue for financial support, in response to COVID-19 impacts on the local economy and community livelihoods in KKL. Also the BIOFIN Phase II project supporting Thailand implement the Biodiversity Finance Plan through the prioritized solution: *Government Budget Finance Solution – Enhancing effectiveness and biodiversity impact of local budgets in Thailand* - for example, to apply the peat swamp landscape approach as a demonstration of the effectiveness of integrated provincial budget. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accepted. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The UNDP CO (Programme Officers and Senior Management) will continue mainstreaming peat swamp management issue with the INFF and BIOFIN. At least one solution should be invented. | April 2021– Nov 2022 | | UNDP CO, NESDC, ONEP | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 7.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A7. Disseminate completed project deliverables and lessons learned to all relevant national and provincial government agencies and other stakeholders and hold further workshops to generate co-learning:**  At the provincial level, there is an urgent need to disseminate the completed documents to all relevant agencies, as these have not yet been received. The communication gap among key national agencies should also be addressed by sharing project-related documents. Further engagement especially with national and provincial government agencies to finetune understanding as well as capacity building are needed in order to ensure that project results and tools are well understood and taken into consideration. Sharing of lessons learned (successes and challenges) is needed to strengthen peat swamp resource management based on the project experiences. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Rejected. The project team (Wisdom Vast company) has already developed an on-line database is available for the public to view/downlead reports, GIS files. ONEP has no budget to cover the cost of dissemination workshop. Besides, the COVID-19 outbreak has prevented this action. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| N/A | N/A | | N/A | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 8.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A8. Foster cooperation with the private sector on peat swamp management as businesses can benefit from peat swamp carbon restoration.** The impact investment study by the project has promoted this, which needs follow up by various stakeholders (including KKL Task Force and UNDP), not only ONEP, to bring the private sector on board. NGOs can also assist in advocating for this. The Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN)40 Phase II project aiming to support Thailand implement its Biodiversity Finance Plan at national and subnational levels provides opportunity for support, especially through its *Private Sector Finance Solution: Mobilizing the private sector and impact investment in support of biodiversity*. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accepted. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| 8.1 UNDP Thailand CO team will continue to work on an opportunity to leverage fund/interest from private sector to invest in preparing the detailed pitch decks. | April-Dec 2021, longer if funding available | | UNDP (Programme Officers, Accelerator Lab, Thailand Policy Lab, Economist, Senior Management, and BIOFIN Project) | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 9.**  **Category 1: Completing, applying and socializing project deliverables**  **A9. Support further work on indirect economic valuation of ecosystem services of Kuan Kreng Peat Swamp** - to be used for policy decision making as the indirect benefits are greater than direct one (e.g. flood control, carbon sink, etc.). The economic valuation work done during the extension period has provided useful information on this. It is generally difficult to capture the value of regulatory ecosystem services, therefore it recommended to link follow up to the UNEP/GEF project with ONEP on *Integration of Natural Capital Accounting in Public and Private Sector Policy and Decision-making for Sustainable Landscapes,* which includes development of policy and market incentives for key sectors and networking for mainstreaming of NCA. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accepted. The aggregated direct and indirect economic valuation of peat swamp is a key information for policy making to prevent the transformation of peat area to other types of land use. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The Programme Analyst will liaise with UNEP focal point for the Integration of Natural Capital Accounting in Public and Private Sector Policy and Decision-making for Sustainable project. The direct economic value data will be shared with the project team. | June-Dec 2021 / duration of UNEP / GEF NCA project | | ONEP, DWR, UNEP | | UNEP is setting up the project management unit with the TDRI.  ONEP is transferring Wetland and Ramsar related mandate to DWR. | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 10.**  **Category 2: Facilitating outcome sustainability – Policy actions**  **B1. Complete the process for government review and endorsement of the National Strategy on Peat Swamps, according to the following steps:**   1. **a)** Circulate the draft national strategy on peat swamps to related government agencies to review in detail (as the previous COVID situation prevented PSU to hold seminars / workshops 2. **b)** Submit the revised national strategy on peat swamps to the Wetland Technical Committee for review 3. **c)** Forward the revised draft (considered by Wetland Technical Committee) to the Wetland Management Sub-Committee, then National Environment Committee, and finally Cabinet for endorsement. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Partially accepted. Since 2020, MoNRE has transferred responsibility on Wetland Management to the Department of Water Resource (DWR). The process will be steered by the DWR in consultation with ONEP. DWR is a responsible agency for the Water Resources Management Act B.E. 2561 (2019). | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| DWR will ensure that their consultant firm will use the draft national strategy as a reference for consultation with national and local stakeholders further. | June 2021 – April 2022 | | DWR, facilitation support from UNDP CO and ONEP | | TEAM consultant public company limited has signed the contract with DWR to carry out a one- year project on Peat Swamp protection project. | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 11**  **Category 2: Facilitating outcome sustainability – Policy actions**  **B 2. Integrate the National Strategy on Peat Swamps into relevant national action plans and seek endorsement from Cabinet:**   1. a. National Action Plan on Sustainable Conservation and Utilization of Biodiversity 2. b. National Action Plan on Climate Change | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accepted. Since the project ended, the peat swamp strategy should be embedded into relevant action plans, including the 20-year National Development Master Plan, 13th NESDP, MoNRE Strategic Plan, Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Consumption Plan, Climate Change Master Plan. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The respective departments (a,b) will drive the action plan to the cabinet endorsement. | August 2021-August 2022 | | ONEP; facilitation support from UNDP CO | |  | | |  | |
| The Prince of Songkhla University (PSU) will mainstream the draft strategy for Peat Swamp Management into the 13th NESDP, through an appropriate pillar. | April 2021 – April 2022 | | PSU | | Dr. Noparat (PSU) is a member of the 13th NESDP development process. He has already included the strategic issues for peat swamp management under Wetland Thematic Area and GHG thematic area. | | | In progress | |
| UNDP’s NDC Support project manager will take peat swamp carbon sequestration issues into consideration of the National Action Plan on Climate Change (advance NDC). | May 2021 – August 2022 | | UNDP, Climate Change Coordination Div, ONEP | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 12**  **Category 2: Facilitating outcome sustainability – Policy actions**  **B3. Propose an amendment to the Cabinet Resolutions** on 1 August B.E. 2543 and 3 November B.E. 2552 as follows:   1. a) **Revise and prioritize the list of wetland areas** by adding the peat swamps listed in the PSU inventory of peat swamps 2. b) **Revise the list of critical wetland areas urgently requiring restoration and conservation**, based on the PSU and project’s works specifying the peat swamp areas that are under threat | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accepted. The legislative framework on wetland protection will protect peat swamp in the future. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The programme analyst will monitor the transition process from ONEP to DWR with regard to the mission on wetland management. | April -Dec 2021- | | DWR;  facilitation support from ONEP | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 13**  **Category 2: Facilitating outcome sustainability – Policy actions**  **B4. Propose to the Cabinet to designate Kuan Kreng Peat Swamp and other peat swamps as Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention.**  Project Output 1.1 proposed Ramsar Site designation of the Kuan Kreng peat swamp by Year 2 of the project. So this measure is needed to address this gap in project outcomes (it is not reflected in the results framework, strangely). The designation of other peat swamps is highly desirable in order to promote their conservation and sustainable use, and to raise their profile among local stakeholders. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Partially accepted. Being a Ramsar site will help protect the peat swamp for the community and will prevent unchecked infrastructure development projects in the peat swamp area. However, the detailed study for Ramsar site nomination is essential and need to be proposed by local community. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| Either Prince Songkhla University or RECOFTC will propose Kuan Kreng Peat Swamp as Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention. | June - 2021- April 2022 | | DWR in associate with ONEP | | Technical support for Ramsar Site datasheet, map and proposal are needed | | | Not initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 14**  **Category 2: Facilitating outcome sustainability – Policy actions**  **B5.**  **Expand Kuan Ki Sien Ramsar Site to cover Thale Noi NHA**  The expansion of this Ramsar Site to the whole of the NHA is logical to cover all wetland habitats and adjacent drylands within the KKL – so the whole area of the NHA within Phatthalung province is covered by one Ramsar Site, while a second new site (above) would cover the remainder of KKL in NST province. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accepted. The Kuan Ki Sien Ramsar Site is situate in the Non-hunting Ta Lay Noi zone where both locations are the same ecosystem. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The DWR’s consulting firm will coordinate with the technical working group on Ramsar site under ONEP/DWR. | May – Dec 2021 | | DWR | | Technical support for revised Ramsar Site datasheet, map and proposal are needed | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 15**  **Category 2: Facilitating outcome sustainability – Policy actions**  **B6.**  **Propose to the Cabinet to designate To Daeng Peat Swamp as an ASEAN Heritage Site**  As the largest peat swamp in Thailand, and one of the best studied sites, this would be excellent recognition for To Daeng (aka Sirindhorn peat swamp) in Narathiwat Province (area: 120,000 rai or about 19,200 hectares) and everyone who has worked on it over the years. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accept | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The DWR’s consulting firm will coordinate with the technical working group on Ramsar site under ONEP/DWR to determine this idea and process a formal nomination | May – Dec 2021 | | DNP | | Technical support for ASEAN Heritage Site  The location is a National Park, under responsible of DNP. | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 16**  **Category 3: Strengthening M&E and adaptive management**  **C1.**  **Systematically address PIR recommendations through adaptive management procedures:**  A consistent weakness throughout the project was that RTA recommendations included in PIR assessments were not fully followed up, indicating that the mechanism for achieving adaptive management was not effective. The lesson learned is that UNDP CO needs to systematically include PIR recommendations in regular monitoring and reporting mechanisms with project PMUs to allow better tracking and monitoring of responses. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Partially accepted. UNDP CO had systematically flagged the PMU on critical PIR comments for further action; however, it did not receive satisfactory results due to human capacity’s constraint of the PMU on project management against the result framework and reporting system. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| UNDO CO has initiated the new FTA position responsible for M&E of the project/programme. | April 2021 onwards | | UNDP CO | | On-going recruitment | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 17**  **Category 3: Strengthening M&E and adaptive management**  **C2.**  **Quarterly Progress Report (QPR) templates should be standardized as part of a global UNDP/GEF reporting system, and specify gender and safeguard reporting requirements:**  The QPR template for this project was very activity-based initially, so this was improved after MTR to be more output-oriented and better aligned with annual PIR assessments. The format used for QPRs is presumably based on a UNDP template which is HACT-compliant, but is determined by the individual UNDP Country Offices, independent of the UNDP Vertical Fund Directorate, and as such it is variable between countries. The issue is that the information in the QPRs does not feed seamlessly into the PIR reporting and assessment, and that RTAs do not have direct access to the QPRs to provide more detailed basis for their assessment reviews, limiting the usefulness of the PIRs as an M&E mechanism. The lesson learned is that QPR formats should be better aligned – and ideally globally standardized – to provide a more integrated and efficient reporting system on GEF projects for UNDP. Secondly, the QPR template needs to explicitly require reporting on gender mainstreaming and social and environmental safeguards in support of the PIRs and more consistent application of UNDP standards across the Country Office network. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Reject. The current QPR template contains a section on Gender and Safeguard. Also, the PIR online contains both sections. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| N/A | N/A | | N/A | |  | | |  | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 18**  **Category 3: Strengthening M&E and adaptive management**  **C3.**  **Strengthen engagement of Project Board members and other key staff of national agencies in GEF projects through special briefing sessions, round table discussions, field visits to project sites and involvement in technical Working Groups:**  At the national level, apart from reporting progress to the PB members, direct engagement with key departments such as the Department of National Parks, Royal Irrigation Department, and Water Resources Department was not observed. It would have been more effective if key management levels of those departments were involved at national level so they could direct the provincial and local offices to support the works done in the project landscape area. It was insufficient to rely on PB members who participated in the PB meetings to communicate this project to their own respective departments, because they had no opportunity to fully understand the issues involved. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Rejected. The Project Board was convened by ONEP (IP) and RECOFTC (PMU) twice a year. ONEP always reached out to a senior leadership of those agencies and even organized a project board meeting and field trip for the project board members . The Provincial Office of MoNRE in the project sites was the key senior management involved with this project implementation. He/she is mandated to mainstream environmental issues into the provincial development plan. Therefore, the IP and PMU relied on this national and sub-national coordination and management mechanism. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| N/A |  | |  | |  | | |  | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 19**  **Category 4: Resolving outstanding audit and safeguard issues**  **D1. Conduct a full project audit of GEF-funded activities from December 2018 to project close in 2021** using remaining uncommitted GEF funds. During the project period, no full project audit was conducted, only a HACT assessment of RECOFTC as RP in April 2018 and a spot check for the period May-November 2018 on RECOFTC’s activities. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Rejected. Regular QA exercises were done throughout the project (HACT 2018, ICA 2019, Spot Check 2020) and shared with the TE consultants. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| N/A |  | |  | |  | | |  | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 20**  **Category 4: Resolving outstanding audit and safeguard issues**  **D2.**  **Include an updated SESP in the project closure report and ensure enhanced oversight on safeguards for future projects**:  As recommended by the MTR and noted in subsequent PIR assessments, there were weaknesses in the original SESP that required review and attention. Consequently, the project has a moderate risk rating in the PIMS+ risk management dashboard due to the unsatisfactory MTR outcome rating. New or escalated safeguards risks were documented in the PIRs, but never finalized in an updated SESP. While it is too late to apply such changes to implementation, the reviewed and updated SESP should be included in the project’s closure report, to assist the IP with ongoing monitoring and management of any safeguard-related risks to sustainability. Enhanced oversight on safeguards should be ensured for future projects. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Partially accepted. The SESP was prepared during the project design phase (PIF). It is time consume, human resources and budget required whereas the approved work plan has no budget line for updating the SESP. Therefore, this task is a burden to the programme team of CO. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| The programme analyst will update the SESP. | April -May 2021 | | UNDP CO | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 21**  **Category 5: Host country governance of GEF project implementation**  **E1. Develop and agree on a streamlined mechanism for host country governmental approval of GEF projects.** The necessity for Cabinet approval of the project document for the current project was responsible for a major delay of more than 18 months, from which project implementation never really recovered. To avoid similar impacts on other GEF projects, it is advisable to negotiate a more efficient mechanism. For example, in certain other countries, the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan is signed by government and used as the framework for UNDP/GEF project approval, allowing the implementing partner agency to sign the project document rather than requiring Cabinet approval | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Fully accept. This process can be done in preparation for GEF-8 project identification phase. UNDP Thailand Country Office is among the accredited GEF agencies in Thailand. UNDP (BRH and CO) will co-organize a one-day workshop together with all GEF agencies to discuss the mechanism for government’s projects screening and approval in consultation with the Office of the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) and experienced implementing agencies under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Ministry of Industry, Ministry of Energy. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| UNDP CO to organize a capacity building workshop for Thailand governance of GEF project implementation | June 2021 – June 2022 | | GEF OFP, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, UNDP (and possibly other GEF IAs such as UNEP) | |  | | | Initiated | |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 22**  **Category 5: Host country governance of GEF project implementation**  **E2. Provide capacity development support to GEF project IPs to ensure stronger understanding of UNDP/GEF project policies and execution requirements.** The requirements of GEF project execution are constantly evolving, and involve attention to M&E, gender mainstreaming, social and environmental safeguards, risk management, stakeholder engagement and other matters. The GEF and UNDP policies and procedures for execution are often not consistent with national government, thus placing the IP in the awkward position of having to meet the needs of two systems simultaneously that do not fully align. Orientation support for relevant IP staff before and during GEF projects would help to resolve such issues and improve project execution performance. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Management response**: Partially accept. This process can be done in preparation for GEF-8 project identification phase. UNDP Thailand Country Office is among the accredited GEF agencies in Thailand. UNDP (BRH and CO) will co-organize a one-day workshop together with all GEF agencies to discuss the mechanism for government’s projects screening and approval in consultation with the Office of the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) and experienced implementing agencies under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Ministry of Industry, Ministry of Energy. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | | **Responsible unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | | |
| **Comments** | | | **Status** | |
| UNDP CO to organize a capacity building workshop for Thailand governance of GEF project implementation | June – Dec 2021 | | GEF OFP, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, UNDP (and possibly other GEF IAs such as UNEP) | |  | | | Initiated | |

1. Select one: Fully Accept, Partially Accept, Reject [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Select one: Not initiated, Initiated, Completed, Completed, No longer applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-3)