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**Context**

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

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

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

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

**Project background**

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

These will be achieved through two Outcomes.

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

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

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

**Findings**

The MTR concluded that at mid-term progress was ***Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)*** at the Outcome level. For Outcome 1: Enabling framework and capacity to manage ES in productive landscapes strengthened Strengthening on-ground conservation actions and wildlife protection, MTR gave Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) due to overall progress against achievement indicators are low. Specific explanations are:

1. The review of legislation related to ES and habitat protection as reported at 30 June 2017 has been conducted but is not 100% complete due to the change of project responsible parties. Draft Bill is not ready yet.
2. Only some activities are done for species management plans and ES integrated provincial plans in Samut Sakhon, Petchaburi, Ranong, but much progress in Burirum through ZPO and ONEP, there are no activities to support ES Bill and ONEP’s capacity building.

For outcome 2- Critical Habitat management demonstrated for three Endangered Species, the MTR also gave Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) due to overall progress against achievement indicators are low. Specific explanations are:

1. Awareness, technology/methods of production, and marketing opportunities are being identified and implemented to expand the area of production landscape that integrate environmentally friendly production. But this was not from direct contribution of the project activities and partially due to the similar engagement done in the past by other projects and partly due to efforts taken in Buriram.
2. Eco-tourism opportunity is clearly identified but not being effectively supported by another responsible government agencies such as BEDO and Tourism authorities. A lot of work needed for tourism activities strengthening.

The MTR team made seventeen (17) recommendations for improvement. Of these, ten (10) are fully agreed, three (3) are partially agreed and four (4) are disagreed. Actions to implement recommendations are detailed in this management response.

The MTR conclusions are based on the evidence gathered and connected to the MTR’s findings. The conclusions highlight the strengths, issues and the ratings of the results/achievements of the project.

**Project design**

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

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

**Project implementation**

Project commencement was as soon as the project document signed and the management structure of Project Board (PB) and Project Management Unit (PMU) was set up early. However, it is noted that there were some communications lapse between the PMU, ONEP and UNDP which resulted in slow progress of the activities in **2016-2017**. The project implementation was severely delayed due to the non-operation of the project management unit for nearly 12 months since the departure of the previous Project Manager. The project has done well in terms of adaptive management decision to create another RP with IUCN as project manager as well as responsible part for outcome 1 and part of outcome 2 delivery. It’s unfortunate, that there was further delay in the commencement of IUCN’s work as Responsible Party (RP) due to internal management changes. Consequently, the delivery of the project is low.

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

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

**Progress towards outcome**

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

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

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

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

**Sustainability**

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

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

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

**Recommendations and management response**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 1:** Result Framework, there are seven points that the PMU and Project Board will consider revising indicator/baseline/targets. The key main point concerns to the ES legislation. The ES legislation is not ready and progress towards it has been very slow. It is the view of most of the stakeholders that approved legislation will take a longer time and could be beyond the timeframe of the project.  The targeted provincial plans for the integration of the ES critical habitat has not taken place. There is discussion on this but only at two of the three sites. At the national level no discussion or dialogue or awareness taking place. Identification of these areas and some form of socialization of their importance is taking place especially at the community level.  Revise indicator/baseline/targets   1. Target for indicator 2 of the project objective is changed to “no overall decline in species status of SPB, WL and ESC” from “No overall decline in species status of species currently listed on the National Red list for Thailand”. 2. Target for indicator 1 of Outcome1 is changed to “draft Bill recommended to NEB after consultation with stakeholders from “Bill approved by Cabinet” 3. Target for indicator 2 of Outcome 1 is changed to “land use zoning for ES and critical habitat at these 5 provinces completed and submitted to the TCPD for inclusion in the provincial plans” from “At least 5 provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas” 4. Indicator 4 of Outcome 1 to include indicators 5, 9 and 10 in addition to the current score for indicator 2,3 and 11. 5. Baseline for Indicator 2 of Outcome 2 on Spoon-billed Sandpiper to be reduce to 2 from 4 at pilot location in Khok Kham. (This is in line with the suggestion made at the Inception) 6. Target for indicator 3 of Outcome 2 is ambiguous – “No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location”. It should be measured in the form of “ha pan salt” or “mudflats km2” or “ha of new aquaculture and development areas” between the start of the project and end of project, within the habitat in Khok Kham location. MTR team recommends that BCST/IUCN/ONEP to suggest this in the next PB based on the information available. 7. Baseline for indicator 3 of Outcome 2 on number of “wild Water Onion collected to exported out of Thailand” seems to be outdated from 2009 figures. There should have been updated data on this from Plan Quarantine Officials. MTR recommends that the baseline level use 2014/15/16 figure. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Partially agree. The MTR suggested to change seven (7) target indicators. The management agreed with the suggested change in some indicators i.e. no overall decline in species status of SPB, WL and ESC, land use zoning for ES and critical habitat at these 5 provinces completed and submitted to the Town Country Planning and Development (TCPD) for inclusion in the provincial plans, Spoon-billed Sandpiper to be reduced to 2 from 4 at pilot location in Khok Kham, change of indicator measurement on “No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location”.  The management disagreed with the suggested change in mainstreaming all three project’s indicators (5,9,10) of ONEP’s score card. Only indicator 5 (to increase stakeholder access to biodiversity database) is relevant to the ONEP’s score card. Besides, the management partially agreed to change a target that will propose a draft Bill recommended to NEB, but will propose a regulatory/policy recommendation to the sub-committee of NEB by the end of project. As ONEP is a secretariat of the sub-committee of NEB, it is their mandate to ensure that recommendation to include into the sub-committee’s meeting agenda.  The PMU and PB disagreed with the suggested change in success measurement of indicator “No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location”. This narrative indicator is still relevant.  Last, the management disagreed with shift in baseline year of “wild Water Onion collected to exported out of Thailand” from 2009 to 2014/15/16. The management will keep the same baseline year and will report that by the end of project the wild water onion is not illegally exported with reference to Thailand CITES committee report. | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time**  **Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The Project Manager (PMU) will propose the change or not change to ONEP prior to the PB meetings. | Q1/19 | PMU and Project Board | For target indicator 2 of the project objective, this is beyond the ability of the project to control the status changes, as the project is more focused on the 3 species.  For target indicator 1, the PMU and PB takes concern in protocol on organizing the NEB meeting as the board is chaired by the Prime Minister. The NEB is rarely scheduled annually. The project is end in September 2019. The PMU and PB cannot control this protocol.  Instead to submit the draft Bill recommendations to the NEB, the ONEP will submit it to the sub-committee of NEB where this committee is the same group of people who participate in the Natural Resources Management Reform process under the Ministry of Natural Resources Management and Environment (MoNRE). Law and legislation are one component of the reform process.  Correct number areas from 600 ha to 179.2 ha. In Khok Kham location.  Agreed to reduce the indicator to 2 Spoon-bill Sandpiper and the indicator for Water Onion will be revised as recommended, which is the blossom areas of 3.125 Rai (0.5 ha).  Eastern Sarus Crane increases in survival rate of reintroduced population, which is now 70% in the last 3 years  No illegal case of Water Onion export at Suwannabhummi International Airport Check Point. | The Project Board meeting on 11 February approved the proposed change as per the above management response.    Further, the PMU will propose to the PB meeting on 13 June that this target will be changed to “regulatory/policy recommendation will be submitted to the sub-committee of NEB by the end of project. As ONEP is a secretariat of the sub-committee of NEB, it is their mandate to ensure that recommendation to include into the sub-committee’s meeting agenda”.  The regulations at the SAO level could be the main legal framework for legalizing conservation scheme of the 3 ES and its habitats under the project. The PMU hired a legal specialist to review the relevant regulation and give recommendation for the land use planning.  Regarding the land use zoning for ES and critical habitat in 5 provinces, Thailand Environment Institute (service provider) has already developed the national framework and provincial framework on land use plan and conservation plan for 4 provinces; Samut Sakhon, Ranong, Petchburi, Phang Nga and ZPO (Responsible Party) developed one for Burirum. The draft plans for all provinces have been reviewed and went through the public hearing of the provincial committee. Final plans for Ranong has been endorsed by the Governor and PONRE and integrated into the Provincial Development Plan. The rest will be endorsed in June 2019.  ONEP is working on integration of the indicator no. 5 into ONEP’s score card. |
| Project team to submit proposed results framework changes to RTA for approval prior to the 2019 PIR | Q3/2019 | PMU |  |  |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 2:** Project Management, the project needs a no-cost extension of 6 months in order to have adequate time to complete all the activities of the revised work plan. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Disagree. Please see the explanation from comment and status. | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Units** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The Programme Analyst will monitor closely with the project manager regarding the progress of activity and plan to ensure project is delivered within remaining months of implementation. ~~The PMU will present the outputs as of mid-June 2019 for PB consideration whether the project needs to be extended or not. The new end of project date should be revised to March 2020~~ | Q2/19 | PB and UNDP | As ZPO is nearly make it to reach their output’s objective. The PMU (IUCN) is speeding the activities in 2019 to achieve outcomes. It is be able to complete their task within the project time frame. The PMU has completed 40% of activities and will complete 80% by the end of July 2019. These include land use planning and zoning in Samut Sakhon, training and capacity building, eco-tourism package, project sub-committee at provincial level. The remaining works will be reviewed by ONEP and UNDP (by mid-June). Both ONEP and UNDP will consolidate current activities as main work package that will be embedded into existing training government institutes, sustainable tourisum authority, provincial office. These government agencies can help implementing the project (through network). | The PMU (IUCN) is pretty sure that the development outputs can be achieved in July 2019. The terminal evaluation can be prepared in August-September 2019. There is no need to extend the project. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 3:** The constant communications between PMU and ONEP must be enhanced. They should meet every fortnight to discuss updates on implementation of activities without waiting for the PB’s meetings to resolve issues. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Disagree.Please see an explanation in comment and status. | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| PMU will create a real time communication tool and event calendar. | Q1/19 | PMU/ONEP | In 2016-2017, there was change of personnel who reported directly to the Project Director (ONEP). Besides, the project has no Project Manager and team for 4 months. IUCN has been on board as PMU since April 2018. The Project Manager and team are on board in July 2018. They sit in ONEP.  During 4-month vacancy of the project team, UNDP regularly communicated a status of procurement the responsible party to replace the project manager role. | As of March 2019, the event calendar of the PMU activity is well informed. It is useful to ONEP and UNDP for planning in advance to join some of these events and activities.  Group LINE application is used for real time communication among PMU, ONEP, UNDP. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 4:** PB must meet at least twice a year as a best practice for the UNDP GEF projects. In the case of this project, the PB must meet at least three times this year to monitor the progress of the project and expediate decision making. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| As ONEP is a secretariat of the PB, ONEP will take this recommendation into the Project Director’s consideration. | Q1/19 | PB | Same as a comment in recommendation 3. | In 2019, the PB are scheduled for three times (Feb, Jun, Sept). |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 5:** The project should urgently record the co-financing from the government – ONEP and ZPO, and other institutions like TEI, IUCN to reflect the contribution and commitment of Thailand toward this global biodiversity benefits in the form of ES conservation. The MTR team has provided examples of template to record in-kind co-financing for the use of the project. UNDP’s co-financing should also be recorded. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The Project Assistant and Programme Associate of UNDP will collect data from PMU. | Q3/19 | PMU/UNDP | This data collection is difficult task for PMU since they joined the project in 2018. They can look at the fiscal year plan of UNDP, ONEP, DNP, IUCN, ZPO, TEI from 2016-2020. | On-going |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 6:** Monitoring and Evaluation, the GEF tracking tool, Capacity Assessment Scorecard need to be completed immediately in early 2019 and then do another one at the end of the project. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Partially agree. As this is a mid-sized project the GEF tracking tool did not need to be completed at mid-term – therefore it will be completed prior to the end of the project. | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The Project Assistant of UNDP will process an individual consultant to update the tracking tool ahead of the end of the project. | Q2/2019 | UNDP/ONEP/PMU | Small size is not required the Tracking Tool by GEF at mid-term. | Tracking tool is under processing by the M&E consultant. It is expected to finish by end of June 2019. To be used for TE. |
| Capacity development scorecard to be completed by end of project |  |  |  |  |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 7:** ES recovery and conservation plans at 3 sites, the SBP conservation is the most difficult task for this project/Thailand. There are two forms of conservation reliance - whether management is directed toward populations or toward extrinsic th. reats. In the case of SBP both are very challenging. As such, there should be greater emphasis in the form of additional funding and urgent land use plan discussion at Samut Sakhon. A community empowerment specialist needs to be appointed to form strong grouping of the community there to support the SBP conservation. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The Project Manager (PMU/IUCN) will empower BCS in developing a community tourism package benefit sharing among the private salt pan’s owners. | Q1/19 | PMU/IUCN | The leaders from BCS can take role as a community empowerment specialist.  There are some conflict issue arises from Kok Kham communities on land use. The communities’ conflict should be solved prior to have Tumbol integrated land use plan with conserving critic habitats and ES conservation, as well as the community engagement on tourist information centre at Kok Kham, Samut Sakhon. The additional funding and urgent consultation are needed to reach community participation in tourist information centre management. | The Project Management Unit together with TEI, BCS, and ONEP have arranged a consultative meeting on 12 June with the Samut Sakhon provincial office. They aim to mainstream SBP conservation plan into the Key Performance Indicators of the Provincial Development Plan.  Also, the financial solutions for SBP conservation are to be developed.  In June, BCS is going to sign MoU with the Department of Marine and Coastal Resources (DMCR). This MoU is a policy to protect the salt pan and mangrove forest of the SBP habitat. BCS is being launch a fund raising campaign for saving SBP habitat. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 8:** For Water Onion, a tourist coordinator/specialist need to be appointed so that the community’s aspiration for a social enterprise using ecotourism can support sustain the habitat as well as regeneration of WO. In addition, the local provincial government should consider providing “temporary occupation licence” to the community on the use of the public land for sustainable livelihood in order to enhance ownership to this effort. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Partiallyagree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU/IUCN will consider promoting a tourism in the 3 pilot sites. | Q1/19 | PMU/IUCN/  LAC | The tourism promotion is not a success target indicator. However, the representative from the department of sustainable tourism is a member of the project committee at the provincial level. S/he has mandated to mainstream the sustainable tourism opportunity from the project in their development plan. | For Water Lily, Ranong Governor give priority to WL in Ranong. This recommendation will be further informed to Ranong PONRE. The Local tour guides is being trained. The local tour guide card will be setup. To provide “temporary occupation licence” |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 9:** In Buriram, the community are ready to create social enterprise to develop sustainable agriculture and to provide protection to ESC. The project should support the setting up of such entity. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU and ZPO will make a capacity building plan and exiting strategy for this project sustainability. | Q1/19 | PMU/ZPO | The organic rice farmer (Sarus rice brand) has already registered as a social enterprise under the Ministry of Commerce. The project did not involve with this registration. It was supported by the government programme “Pra-Cha-Rat” and private company “Thai Bev”. | After the construction of Eastern Sarus Crane learning center finished. First period, the project plan to set up the committees for managing all activities, including of support the communities’ enterprise. The first budget supports by Buriram Sugar factory with co-management of ZPO. However, it will be developed to be foundation in future. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 10:** Stakeholders’ engagement, the new Work Plan 2018-2019 should be verified with LAC and provincial stakeholders in order to get the support from them – the stakeholders need to know their roles, activities and budgets available for the remaining period of the project. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Disagree. In fact, the project team did consultation with local stakeholders through PONRE officer in Samut Sakhon, Ranong, Burirum who is a focal point of the Governors when it comes to environmental issues. Especially, the ZPO team works closely with the school and Head of Wildlife Protected Area in Sarus Crane monitoring plan. | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU will ensure that the LAC is aware the work plan by sending information to LAC one-two weeks before the meeting dates. | Q1/19 | PMU/LAC | The MTR team took information from the interviewee who mentioned the situation in 2016-2017. | The current PMU works closely with PONRE officer who is the key actor of the project’s provincial committee. The project workplan 2018-2019 is well informed. The new WP 2019 was shared to LAC and PONRE to know their roles, activities and budget available. Activities calendar throughout the year was also shared among concerned parties. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 11:** Set up TWGs for outcome that involves direct functions of related agencies; TWG for eco-tourism, TWG for land use plans with TCP and TWG for Law with the AG office. The role of Tourism Authority and BEDO need to be redefined so that their involvement will be more meaningful and constructive through these TWGs. The TWGs should be responsible to report the achievements to the PB, instead of relying on the PMU. The RPs should not be driving the interagency coordination but rather facilitate this mechanism. The related agencies should be leading the TWGs. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Disagree. There are existing mechanisms that can be integrated with rather than establishing new groups. | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The Project Manager (PMU/IUCN) will discuss with ONEP and UNDP about the need to set up the TWG and potential existing alternatives that might work better than establishing new TWGs. | Q1/19 | PMU/PB/UNDP/ONEP | The TWGs for outcome that involves direct functions may not needed to be setup due to both existing Ranong TWG on Water Lily Conservation, Chair by Ranong Governor, and Samut Sakhon TWG on Spoon-billed Sandpiper, Chair by Samut Sakhon Deputy Governor, comprise of representative from Provincial Tourist Office. Chairs of TWGs are PB members which have mandates to report the progress on project implementation. The provincial activities well be integrated into provincial plan. It would be better to incorporate into “Nawatwitthi” project of the community. The Nawatwitthi was promoted to all communities by Community Development Department (CDD)--create community tourism with One Tambol One Product (OTOP). | No TWGs |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 12:** Knowledge management and Communication, Cross learning between the stakeholders in the 3 sites should be enhanced. There should be more field visits between them to learn from one another. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU/ZPO will create the cross-learning activity into the workplan 2019. | Q1/2019 | PMU/RPs/  UNDP | Activity is being done in Q1-Q2/2019. | The cross leaning between the stakeholders in ES were included in the plan, both from international and domestic best practices.  M&E consultant is monitoring this output. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 13:** Knowledge products need to be developed to showcase the actions and results of the project. For example, the gender dimension in some of the sites are very impressive. These stories need to be told in outreach products. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU/ZPO will collect data on gender, youth dimensions. | Q3/19 | PMU/RPs/  UNDP | The knowledge product was developed since the beginning of project duration. It was done by ZPO and UNDP such as VDO clip, articles, fact sheets. | The PMU is creating the data aggregation on gender and youth. |
| Create communications story for project on UNDP EBD EXPOSURE platform sharing successes |  |  |  |  |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 14:** Project webpage/Facebook/ need to be created as soon as possible to enhance the awareness and support the project. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU will ensure visibility of project in line with UNDP GEF communication guideline. | Q2/19 | PMU/RPs/  UNDP | Project information and actives is published and updated on IUCN, as PMU, website. | The PMU has already hired a company to create a project website. It will link with ONEP page. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 15:** Sustainability, the project should develop an exit plan for sustainability of the outcomes. This is especially with the revised target of the indicator for Outcome 1 from ES Bill approved to draft bill submitted to NEB. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PB needs to decide and endorsed the proposal from the PMU. | Q2/19 | PMU/RP/ONEP/PB/  UNDP | To ensure responsibility of project beyond the lifetime, the PMU needs to proceed project activities through the government agencies responsible for training, sustainable tourism, biodiversity database, etc. | On-going  Working relationship among ONEP, PONRE, UNDP, ZPO, PMU are improved by the real time communication tool (Group LINE application). This is basis to develop a cooperation among the cross agencies within ONEP and the Ministries. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 16:** Use the opportunity of the project to do capacity building of ONEP and the production landscape agencies on managing mainstreaming approach, including incentives and disincentive that can be incorporated into development plans of the agencies. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU will work with ONEP division responsible for ES database and exchange learning from other countries. | Q3/19 | PMU/RP/ONEP/PB/  UNDP | Supported, capacity building of ONEP of ES conservation including ES database was incorporated into existing plan for future ES monitoring and management. | On-going training on GIS database management for national ES list. |
| **Mid-term Review Recommendation 17:** The Local Advisory Committee should be institutionalised at the provincial level as the one-stop entity to organise and manage all ES species related funds, projects and activities from government, NGOs and private sector to synergise the ES conservation efforts. | | | | |
| **Management Response:** Agree | | | | |
| **Key Actions** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| The PMU will work closely with ONEP to look at existing committee relevant to the role of LAC. | Q3/19 | PMU/RP/ONEP/PB/  UNDP | The Local Advisory Committee (LAC) was in the plan to set up at community level to manage ES conservation fund and relevant activities. | On-going  The PMU is working on the ES economic valuation and finance solutions to support the set up of LAC or use of an existing committee. |