



PROJECT LESSONS-LEARNED REPORT

Total length of report: 2-3 pages.

Please refer to the [Deliverable Description](#) for more information on the purpose and use of this report

Project Title:	Achieving Low Carbon Growth in Cities through Sustainable Urban Systems Management in Thailand
Country:	Thailand
Related CPAP Outcome	Thailand is better prepared to coherently address climate change and environmental security issues through the enhancement of national capacity and policy readiness.
Project Description and Key Lessons-Learned	
Brief description of context	<p>Please give a brief description of the country context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What were the main challenges being faced at the start of the project? <p>Barriers addressed: At the time of ProDoc submission (2016) and continuing on until today, Thailand’s ongoing economic growth has been leading to both negative local environmental impacts (such as increased waste in landfills, traffic jams, and unhealthy air quality resulting from combustion of fossil fuels) and increased greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. While there has long been an institutional framework and progress in developing a strategy to address growing GHG emissions at the national level, local level progress in cities other than Bangkok has been limited. And, at the same time, local-level challenges related to waste, air quality, and traffic jams continue to intensify. Barriers leading to limited progress on both GHG emissions reductions and these local-level problems in mid-sized cities, such as those targeted by <i>LCC</i>, include: (i) Lack of awareness of municipal officials and citizens about GHG emissions and the “win-win” co-benefits of low carbon growth. (ii) Lack of experience and capacity of municipal officials in low carbon planning, (iii) Lack of strong examples of low carbon initiatives in mid-sized municipalities in the waste, transport, and end-use electricity sectors that show both the strong GHG ERs and co-benefits in improving the bottom line, improving air quality, and making the urban environment more attractive and healthful for citizens. (iv) Lack of up-front financing for low carbon initiatives at the municipal level.</p>
Brief description of project	<p>A short description of the project should be provided here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What were the issues the project tried to address? ○ What solutions the project tried to offer? What were its major outputs? <p>The UNDP-TGO-GEF project <i>Achieving Low Carbon Growth in Cities through Sustainable Urban Systems Management in Thailand</i> (“LCC”) was designed as a four-year project with the overall objective of promoting low carbon urban development in mid-sized Thai cities. It pursues the dual aims of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions, economic benefits, and enhancement of the lives of local people through an improved urban environment. Emphasis is on the waste management, transport, and electricity end-use sectors. The project cooperates with the four mid-sized Thai cities of: Nakhon Ratchasima, Chiang Mai, Samui, and Khon Kaen. Project launch date was April 26, 2017 and, with three months extension, project close is July 31,2021. During its last 1.5 years the project has been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic, especially transport sector work in Chiang Mai.</p> <p>GEF funding is USD3.15 M. <i>LCC</i> targets three outcomes for its partner cities:</p>

	<p>(1) low carbon planning, (2) demonstration of low carbon city initiatives, and (3) financing of/ increased investment in low carbon city initiatives. The low carbon planning work features, for each city, development of carbon city footprints and low carbon development strategies, intended to be incorporated into mainstream planning. The demo outcome features a package of demos for each city. NR and KK demos cut across all three sectors: waste management, end use energy/ distributed solar PV, and transport, while Chiang Mai focuses fully on transport and Samui on organic waste management. The financing/ investment outcome was intended to develop financing mechanisms for low carbon development, but its design also features capacity building and awareness raising.</p>
<p>Key project successes</p>	<p>Please describe what has worked well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What have been the key successes of this project? <p>The key success of this project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integration of low carbon city plan in the municipality plan 2. Demonstration of low carbon projects in the waste, energy and transport which were led by the cities, the private sector and communities. 3. Awareness of low carbon city initiative was well accepted and raised 4. Smooth operation of the PMU with low turnover rate 5. Support the mandate of the Implementing partner. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What factors supported this success? <p>The key success factors are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The implementing partner, Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO). The Project Director, Dr. Natarika Wayuparb Nitiphon, had a good vision and paid attention to strategy and implementation of the project. She made a connection with the cities and paid a visit regularly. TGO as the organization best supported the admin processes i.e. approval, hiring and procurement. 2. The Project Management Unit (PMU). The LCC project received a firm commitment from the Project Manager, Project Coordinating Associate, Finance Officer from the beginning of the project until project closure. Turnover rate was zero. Project admin and reporting were excellence due to preparation of the standard operating procedure (SOP) and discipline of staff. 3. The Partner cities. The Project received full cooperation from the top decision makers, the mayor. Each city established a working group to work on this project. The city coordinators played an exceptional role in bridging the cities with the project team. 4. The implementation approach-the participatory approach that drew commitment and support from the partners, including the municipality, the private sector and local communities. 5. Consultant firms and IC had put great effort on their assignments and very cooperate and flexible. These were Chulalongkorn University, Chiang Mai University, Khon Kaen University, Bright Management Consultant, ERM, Mr. Passnakorn Maikate.
<p>Project shortcomings and solutions</p>	<p>Please describe what have been the main challenges of this project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What have been the main challenges/ shortcomings/ unforeseen circumstances of this project? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A tedious admin process on procurement, hiring and general approval at TGO and UNDP sides. 2. Covid19 in early 2020 until the end of project prohibited some low carbon activities in the sectors that were hit hardest (i.e. hotel and transport in Chiang Mai and Samui) as well as routine activities such as travel, in-person meetings and workshops.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Missing institution memory on development and initiation of the project which made the project hard to justify GEF additionality and/or incremental. 4. M&E. Indicators and assessment methodologies on greenhouse gas emission reduction (GHG ER) interpreted by the Project Team was not in agreement with TE consultants. Despite NIM modality with support from UNDP, DPC allocated to the project was not enough due to the additional request from IP for UNDP support services on procurement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How were they overcome (if they were). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need to prepare documents for approval and processes well in advance. We are talking about 3-4 months in advance since the procurement process was exceptionally long and tedious. 2. UNDP-Co allocated money to cover DPC that exceeded the ceiling. ○ Were the project results attained? If not, what changes need to be made to achieve these results in the future? <p>In the view of the Implementing Partner and the Project Team, the results were attained and successfully implemented. On the contrary, the Terminal Evaluation consultants perceived it differently because indicators and assessment methodologies on greenhouse gas emission reduction (GHG ER) interpreted by the Project Team was not in agreement with TE consultants.</p>
<p>Lessons learned</p>	<p>Please think about and describe the key lesson(s) learned from this project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What could have been done differently/ better? ○ What would you recommend to improve future programming or for other similar projects elsewhere. ○ What mistakes should be avoided if the initiative were to be replicated? ○ How easy would it be to replicate the successes in a different context/ country? <p>Provide any other relevant information.</p> <p>The LCC project would have done a better and differently on the followings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. M&E to avoid different interpretation on assessment methodology of project success indicators by getting an official approval on the assessment from UNDP Regional Technical Advisor. This was to show M&E consultants that it was agreed in advance because M&E consultant may see things differently from the project. 2. The CO to document the history of project development and hand over to the Project Team.
<p>Follow-up Actions</p>	<p>Based on the Final Project Review, include a brief record of decisions and conclusions related to follow-up actions.</p> <p>See the management response report.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Project Information</p>	
<p>Award ID:</p>	<p>Project ID: 00086188, Output ID: 00093514</p>
<p>CO Focal Points:</p>	<p>Amornwan Resanond, Project Manager (amornwan.resanond@undp.org)</p>
<p>Partners:</p>	<p>Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO), Thailand Chiang Mai Municipality, Thailand (Focal point Mr. Trinnawat Suwanprik) Khon Kaen Municipality, Thailand (Focal point Mr. Tassanai Prachaubmorn) Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand (Focal point Mr. Netiwit Ruengsukwattana)</p>

	Samui Municipality, Thailand (Focal point Ms. Supinya Srithongkul)
Project resources:	Please feel free to provide weblinks to other project resources and information. https://undp.sharepoint.com/:f:/r/teams/THA/IGSD/IGSD%20Document/93514_LCC?csf=1&web=1&e=59gCC7
Report prepared by:	Amornwan Resanond, Project Manager, UNDP Thailand Country Office
Date:	1 July 2021