|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level Score** | **Midterm  Progress**  **(as of Aug 2018)** | **Terminal Progress**  **(as of March 2021)** | **End of project target level** | **Justification to the figures/ revised methodology** |
| Protected Areas **Threats** scored of METT of HKK, TYE and TYW Wildlife Sanctuaries | N/A | HKK: 3 %  TYE: 13%  TYW: 8 % | HKK: 10 %  TYE: 6 %  TYW: 8 % | TBC | The examination was conducted at Nakornsawan province on 24 March 2021. Since there was a DNP’s workshop on 25 March which many DNP staff have to attend this workshop and have been including three superintendents of project target and their teams. The exam hold on 24 March 2021 in evening at the Paradiso hotel. The methodology of this examination were in-depth interview and focus group discussion (FDG). The member of the assessment of each PA who given the information are including 1) Superintendent, 2) PA staff, 3) administrative staff and 4) external consultant. Before starting the assessment all introduced themselves like name, position and how long that they have been in these PAs. All of them were in the current positions at least for a year and moreover before that all of them are working in these PAs for many years as deputy superintendents as well. Hence, the respondents for this assessments are highly reliable. **This part is the result of Threats session**. The results when compared with the Mid-term progress we found that the scored has been decreasing significantly especially TYE and for TYW is remained the same scored. So, this is showing that there are the improving of PA management on threats during the project implementation. However, when look into HKK the scored the resulted has increased in largely scale. But, when we looking in the detail of each scored of Mid-term progress of HKK. We found that there are only 5 scored out of 156 very low threats, which is impossible to be like that, as the surrounding of HKK has many local communities and many of them are still getting some benefits from HKK forest especially in Toongfeek area which still did not get the final solution yet. Therefore, the scored of Mid-term progress of HKK may errored on collection and I would suggested to hesitate to use that results. |
| Protected areas **Assessment** scored of METT of HKK, TYE and TYW Wildlife Sanctuaries | HKK: 67%  TYE: 75%  TYW: 60% | HKK: 77%  TYE: 76%  TYW: 56% | HKK: 75%  TYE: 77%  TYW: 70% | HKK: 71%  TYE: 77%  TYW: 68% | The examination was conducted at Nakornsawan province on 24 March 2021. Since there was a DNP’s workshop on 25 March which many DNP staff have to attend this workshop and have been including three superintendents of project target and their teams. The exam hold on 24 March 2021 in evening at the Paradiso hotel. The methodology of this examination were in-depth interview and focus group discussion (FDG). The member of the assessment of each PA who given the information are including 1) Superintendent, 2) PA staff, 3) administrative staff and 4) external consultant. Before starting the assessment all introduced themselves like name, position and how long that they have been in these PAs. All of them were in the current positions at least for a year and moreover before that all of them are working in these PAs for many years as deputy superintendents as well. Hence, the respondents for this assessments are highly reliable. **This part is the result of** **Assessment session**. According to baseline level scores in 2016, Terminal progress based on the result of assessment show that all three PAs the scored were increased significantly.  From 30 main questions of assessment, the score of TYW increased greater than HKK and TYE in comparison of based line and mid-term. The resulted in 2021 METT score of TYW, HKK and TYE mainly increased in key main question such as staff capacity, budget sufficiency, involvement of local communities and participation of indigenous people and management while it scores also remain in the same in few key questions including economic benefit, visitor facility and commercial tourism operation which these were commonly understanding as the objectives of these PAs are not for tourism. TYE had minor changed in various questions. |
| Financial sustainability scorecard for the WHS | Total score for WHS system: 79 | Total score for WHS system: 77 | Total score for WHS system: 95 | TBD | Financial sustainability scorecard in 2016 for the WHS was not proper information to measure financial sustainability for 3 wildlife sanctuary areas under SCIWC project because those information captures government budgeting and expenditure in DNP as overall department meaning that it included national park budget and other offices which not relevant to the SCIWC project. Therefore, the proper information in this time must be capture only for these three project sites (HKK, TYW and TYE). This information is focusing on area-based level of the 3 wildlife sanctuaries of the World Heritage, for both 2016 and 2020 separately from the budget allocated for the Wildlife Conservation Office. The result of FSC 2020 has shown that as the objectives of PAs is mainly for conservation that cause to zero scored in the ***component 1- Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks***, element 1 – Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue generations by PAs and in element 6 -Economic valuation of protected area systems (ecosystem services, tourism based employment etc.) also in ***component 2- Business planning and tools for cost-effective management***, in element 1- business plan and as same as in ***component 3 -Tools for revenue generation by PAs*** in element 2- Setting and establishment of user fees across the PA system, 4- Communication strategies to increase public awareness about the rationale for revenue generation mechanisms, 5 Operational PES schemes for PAs and 6- Concessions operating within PA.  To conclude the FSS for this terminal progress as the Pros and Cons is that; **Pros**; 1. Field management is really based on the capacity and ability of superintendent which these three sites had very good capacity and experienced of superintendents  2. There is a very strong law and regulation on protection and reservation that could help to protected the PA on good conservation.  **Cons:**  1. The law and Government’s rule is not allow that PA to seek any new subsidy by themselves, as the objective of PA is for conservation not tourism. So, the budget management is based from central office allocation. Hence, this is hard to apply for the business plan within PAs. To full fill the gap.  2. In some question scored are zero it is does not mean poor management, but it is because of the law is not allowed such as Element 5 –operational payment for ecosystem service and Element 6- Concession operation within PA |