Terminal Evaluation Report

2020

Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes in Thailand

Executive Summary

Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes in Thailand
UNDP Project ID#:	4839
GEF project ID#:	5512
Evaluation timeframe:	September 2019 to January 2020
Date of evaluation report:	January 2020
Country:	Thailand
Region:	Asia-Pacific
GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program:	BD-2
GEF Agency:	UNDP
Executing Entity / Implementing Partner:	ONEP
Responsible Parties:	ZPO, IUCN
Evaluation team members:	Adrian Stokes

Sustainability t Socio-economic risks	Likely	Community interest and support for the three species is high. Local structures in each target location are in place to oversee conservation, raise awareness and link to sustainable

	Significant	Improvements in ecological status: {The status of the Eastern Sarus Crane in Thailand has changed from Extinct in the Wild to Critically Endangered. {The Water Onion is blooming across a larger area than before the project. Reductions in ecological stress: {Crane-friendly rice-growing practices and farmer behaviors are embedded in the farming community at Buriram. {Local laws enacted in the community mean that very little wild Water Onion is now collected. {A proposed solar farm that would have destroyed Spoon-billed Sandpiper habitat at Khok Kham is not proceeding. {ONEP is proposing to list new migratory bird flyway sites under the East Asian tAustralasian Flyway, in Buriram. {ZPO is now working more closely with the Buriram community and effectively applying a result-based planning and management approach.

Sommayf Cnclias , Recmmendatns and Lens

Cnclias

This project has led to valuable advancements in the understanding of planning and implementation for the protection of ES in Thailand, especially in production landscapes.

The most notable achievements have been under Outcome 2, demonstrating critical habitat management for three ES. The project has worked with communities that have existing local knowledge of and aspirations for three pilot ES, and catalyzed a strategic approach to provincial planning, balancing production with conservation, and alternative livelihoods. The Eastern Sarus Crane (ESC) program in Buriram is an exceptional example of this, where people involved in crane conservation have teamed with organic rice farmers to create a mature market product vSarus Rice vand establish an environment in which cranes are valued and protected; meanwhile, land use planning has influenced the provincial ‰ o v v] v P ‰ Œ } • • š } v • µ Œ š Z š Ì } v] v P] • ‰ ‰ Œ } ‰ Œ] š (} Œ š Z • % provides a high-

Reflecting these high-quality results, the achievement of Outcome 2 of the project has been rated as Satisfactory.

dZ ‰ Œ}i š[•]u•]v Kµš }u í Œ}µv •šŒ vPšZ v]vP dZ]o v [• o P]•o
ES conservation have been less successful. The original aim for an ES and Critical Habitat Bill to be approved by Cabinet was not achieved, because shortly after project commencement this was not a priority for ONEP; instead, a legislative review and recommendations were developed. An opportunity now exists for these findings and recommendations to influence development of a Draft Biodiversity Act. The project document also envisaged a land use planning framework being adopted, which would provide guidelines and a systematized approach to integrating ES conservation into planning processes in Thailand; the framework was to be piloted in the three main project pilot sites. Although this framework was not developed, high-quality land use planning was undertaken to inform provincial planning in five provinces, and these may provide a model for future planning.

A GIS-based management and monitoring system was developed with information on ten species (include
šZ šZŒ š ŒP š •‰]••U }vv š š} KE WDetailed information was
collated for each species on its biology, conservation status, population trends, habitats, existing conservation measures and recommended future actions. Although conservation and recovery plans were not developed for these species, it is anticipated that the information gathered will provide the basis for development of such plans. Finally, the project met targets for improving the internal capacity of ONEP in
• À Œ o]v] š}Œ• Œ o À vš š} šZ ‰Œ}i š[•]u•X

Reflecting these results, the achievement of Outcome 1 of the .000008871 0 5rj 841.92 611E>9618C>-26610201668w.11

Recommendations (*BCST: Bird Conservation Society of Thailand; PONRE: Provincial Office of Natural Resources and Environment)

1		ONEP, BCST

4	The evaluation team observed that there was a high level of interest in the three species in the agencies involved in provincial and local planning. It is important to realize that this awareness and interest was largely due to awareness raising and training providing by the project. Further, technical knowledge of endangered species and critical habitat and how to plan for their conservation and protection is low in most provinces. For these reasons, it cannot be assumed that there will be Á] •‰ Œ µ‰š l }(^ }v• ŒÀ š]}v ‰o vv]vP] of this project. This is especially true because the project did not establish a legislative mechanism whereby provincial and local planning must consider listed ES and critical habitats, as originally proposed in the project document. A program of provincial awareness raising and training on ES and provincial planning would provide an opportunity to communicate relevant lessons of this project across Thailand and increase the technical capacity in the provinces.	ONEP, PONRE
5	A Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) has been engaged by UNDP to ensure ongoing	ONEP, UNDP

	approaches being proposed. In some locations, there were still fundamental questions to be addressed of what the tourism product and market would be. The communities involved in the project would benefit from ongoing support and guidance from agencies in many aspects of developing ecotourism, and the community-based tourism management plan that was being developed by Silpakorn University will be a valuable resource.	

mainstreaming specialist to provide early guidance and technical advice would assist in embedding gender throughout the project cycle.

Effective integration of biodiversity conservation with production and sustainable livelihoods requires working strategically with local communities

The examples from this project, especially the ESC in Buriram, demonstrate that achieving effective integration of biodiversity conservation with production and sustainable livelihoods requires:

- x building on existing local capacity, interests and aspirations
- x bringing in targeted external expertise (e.g. product development, marketing and sales, conservation planning and practice) at the right times
- x coordination.

Legislative development activities in projects should be flexible and responsive to changing government priorities

The aim of this project, to influence legislative and policy change through pilot projects, empowerment of local communities and partnering with national agencies, is appropriate and consistent with the aims of the GEF. In this project, the project document was very detailed and prescriptive about the legislation and land use planning framework that was to be developed, and specifically committed to a bill being approved by Cabinet. This created immediate implementation challenges when ONEP determined early that such a bill was no longer a priority. Further, the project assessed the likelihood of approval of the ES legislation] v P o Ç • Z >wa Á] u r Á Z] Z assessment. Care should be taken in project development that legislative development components are flexible and realistic.

Long-term involvement delivers robust results

ZPO were involved in this project during development and from inception to completion. The work on ESC in Buriram province shows the benefits of such long-term involvement: strong community support, innovative rice product development with local farmers, coordination across agencies and groups, and financial commitment from local businesses. This means that the results ar1ot

also had well-developed management and financial control systems that were assessed by independent auditors as posing low risk to the project.

There were some cons to the RP arrangement. In particular, a PM engaged through UNDP will have a good understanding of UNDP and GEF requirements and processes (such as financial, procurement, reporting and making changes to projects) and can work within these to efficiently implement a project; in contrast, an RP usually has its own organizational requirements and processes that may not align with those of UNDP, and this can create inefficiencies and/or delays in some processes and project activities. Also, when a project manager is engaged by UNDP, they have a broader role as a UNDP team member, which brings added value to the team and to the individual; this added value is not achieved with an RP.

On balance, the evaluation team considers that the approach of engaging an RP was beneficial for delivery of this project under significant pressure.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BCST	Bird Conservation Society of Thailand
BEDO	Based Economy Development Office
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DASTA	Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration
DNP	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation
DPC	

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Evaluation

In accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this terminal evaluation (TE), the objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Further, in accordance with UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects, the evaluation has the following complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments
- To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF-financed UNDP activities
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues
- To contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit
- To gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities, including harmonization with other UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP).

1.2 Scope and Methodology

The scope of the evaluation was to assess any evidence available since project development that will assist in addressing the evaluation's objectives.

The evaluation was undertaken between September 2019 and January 2020. A two-person team implemented the evaluation, comprising a national consultant and an international consultant / team leader.

The evaluation followed the document UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects (UNDP-GEF TE Guidance [hereafter).

The evaluation was based on a detailed review of data and information and extensive stakeholder consultation, to develop evidence-based conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. Where possible, evidence was cross-checked against more than one information source to verify findings.

The following activities were included in the evaluation:

- An evaluation mission to Thailand, including Bangkok and project sites, between 23 September and 3 October 2019; this included face-to-face consultations with a wide range of stakeholders, using semi-structured interviews [in a conversational format. The itinerary and interviewees for the mission are provided in Annex 1 and a summary of the field visits is provided in Annex 2.
- A desktop review of all relevant documents covering project design, implementation progress, and monitoring and review; the list of documents and information is provided in Annex 3.
- An evaluation criteria matrix that details

1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report

This report structure follows the content guidelines provided in the UNDP-GEF TE Guidance document (pp 36 t37).

Background information is first provided on the TE process (this chapter) and the project (Chapter 2). Chapter

production and fishing. d Z] • Z • v µ] o s (Œ } u d Z supply of natural resources, and has resulted in land degradation, loss of natural habitats, and increased water and air pollution.

These processes have presented a number of threats to the maintenance of d Z] o v [biodiversity and the survival of endangered species. The project document describes two particular threats:

- Habitat loss and degradation
- Over-exploitation of natural resources.

At the time of development of this project, Thailand had over ñ ó ñ P o } o o Ç š Z Œ š v • ‰] • } v š Red List and 1,058 v š] } v o o Ç š Z Œ š v • ‰] • } v d Z] o v [• } µ v š Œ Ç Z >] • š

This project aimed to contribute to the conservation of these species through improvements in the management of critical habitats for endangered species[2] (ES). The project chose three ES as pilots for the approach adopted: the Spoon-billed Sandpiper (SBS), Eastern Sarus Crane (ESC), and Water Onion.

The project design identified that the long-term solution was to reform the manner in which agricultural, forestry, aquaculture and other production activities are planned and regulated across different land units and tenure categories at the landscape scale in order to avoid, reduce and mitigate the pressures leading to ES biodiversity loss. This would be brought about through the mainstreaming of biodiversity into existing land use planning and management approaches as well as commercial decision making and enterprise.

The project design identified the following two main barriers to achieving this long-term solution.

The existing focus of conservation policy and financing had been on establishment and management of protected areas, which meant that conservation of ES outside of protected areas (PAs) and in the production landscapes had been ad hocand unsystematic. The project identified deficiencies for ES and critical habitats] v d Z] o v [• framework, planning systems and institutional arrangements.

The project document identified that provincial, district and sub-district public authorities had been guided by the quick-gain philosophy P ,-à ‡ YS(A'ë ˆq •2„ .¿q o dag• 34#RP •2„ .Tdd8871 0 5o1.922 841.5.32 841.92

barriers related to this, particularly a lack of know-how and limited examples within the country of applying land use planning and regulatory frameworks to manage development across different sectors to secure positive biodiversity outcomes, and a lack of operational "on-the-ground" examples of technical interventions that promote biodiversity and ES conservation in production landscapes outside PAs.

The project also identified threats and barriers specific to the three target species.

The Critically Endangered Spoon-billed Sandpiper is a small migratory wader that breeds in north-eastern Russia and winters in South Asia and South-East Asia; small numbers are recorded every year in the inner Gulf of Thailand. The main factor driving the rapid decline is habitat loss in its breeding, passage and wintering grounds, compounded by disturbance, hunting and the effects of climate change. Fledging success and juvenile recruitment are also very low, leading to fears that the population is ageing rapidly.

In Thailand, unsympathetic management of mud flat areas is the major generic threat to the SBS. Specific threats are the ongoing conversion of traditional salt pans to deeper sided aquaculture ponds, changes in the management regimes of salt pans and complete conversion of land use related to industrialization.

The Critically Endangered Eastern Sarus Crane is the South-East Asian subspecies of Sarus Crane (*Grus antigone*). The other two subspecies are located in South Asia and Australia. Threats to all three subspecies include loss and degradation of wetlands as a result of drainage and conversion to agriculture; ingestion of pesticides; hunting of adults, eggs and chicks; and destruction to prevent damage to crops.

The ESC was previously considered extinct in the wild in Thailand; however, Korat Zoo and the ZPO have developed a successful breeding and reintroduction programme and have reintroduced the species into their natural environment at three wetland complexes in Buriram province. At the time of development of this project, this population had not yet started to breed in the wild. The Buriram population of ESC faces similar threats to global populations, including habitat destruction, degradation and disturbance (including from reservoir management, wetland use for agriculture, and invasive species); excessive pesticide use; and hunting or accidental injury.

The Endangered Water Onion is endemic to Thailand and has a very restricted range in southern Thailand. It is an important species in its aquatic habitats, providing habitat and food for many species of aquatic fauna. Previously found on the coastal plain of southern Thailand, it is now known only from a small number of rivers and streams in Ranong and Phang Nga provinces. Local population extinctions have been recorded.

Key threats include: 1. Habitat loss from dredging and removal of sediment to manage flood risk, extraction of sand from riverbeds, and deforestation within the watershed leading to changes in hydrology, sediment loads and nutrient levels. Some of these changes are likely to be exacerbated by climate change, especially changes in rainfall patterns. 2. Unsustainable use through collection from the wild for international trade for aquaria and fishponds.

2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

SMART analysis:

[1]Sub-target added after MTR
[2]Additional capacity development indicator added after MTR

1. Approval of ES and Critical Habitat Bill and landuse planning framework by key decision makers	Bill approved by Cabinet. Sub-target[1]: Legal framework and policy recommendations developed for ES and critical habitats and proposed to wetlands management subcommittee under the National Environmental Board.	µ	µ	?	µ	µ
2. Reduction in threats to ES and critical habitats from landuse change through adoption of landuse zoning for ES and critical habitat conservation within Provincial Plans based on landuse planning framework	5 draft provincial plans clearly integrate the designation of critical habitat areas and increase environmental safeguards for development within these areas. Sub-target[1]: Land use zoning for ES and critical habitats in 5 provinces completed and submitted to the Town Country Planning and Development for inclusion in the provincial plans.	µ	µ	µ	µ	µ
3. Management and monitoring system for endangered species operational indicated by number of species for which conservation and recovery plans are in place, critical habitats are defined, management plans in place utilising GIS decision support tool and monitoring is in action	Target of 10 species. (Target includes 3 pilot species and 7 additional species).	?	µ	µ	µ	µ

4. Improvements in capacity development indicator score for ONEP for:

2. Stability or increase in numbers of populations of the following species at target sites: t Spoon-billed Sandpiper t Water Onion t Eastern Sarus Crane	Spoon-Billed Sandpiper t no reduction in species number Water Onion t 10% increase in blooming areas t 0.55ha ESC > 40 in Wild [population and Wild [breeding taking place.	?	µ	µ	µ	µ
3. Identified threats to targeted species reduced: - Spoon-billed Sandpiper t critical habitat converted for intensive agriculture and urban/industrial development	No increase in area of critical SBS habitat converted to uses incompatible to the long-term survival of SBS in the Khok Kham location.					
- Eastern Sarus Crane t deaths due to excessive pesticide or hunting	ESC increase in survival rate of reintroduced population. Current survival rate 60% over a four year period.					
- Water Onion t Number of Wild [collected plant specimens to exported out of Thailand	At end-of-project, no export recorded of Wild [collected Water Onion at the Suvarnabhumi Airport.					

ES-friendly land management does not lead to sufficient economic gains for households at the project sites	Moderate (Low)	The project mitigated this risk well by focusing on practices that communities have identified as socio-economically sustainable and directing resources to improve this and capacitate the communities.
Migratory species are impacted by threats external to Thailand.	Low (Moderate)	The evaluation team considers that this risk was under-rated, because the likelihood of the Spoon-billed Sandpiper being impacted by threats external to Thailand should be considered øertain [Nevertheless, the response measures have been appropriate: focus efforts to make the domestic environment as favorable and resilient as possible, while participating in international networks for SBS conservation and migratory bird flyway protection.
Changes in climate adversely impact target species	Low (Moderate)	Mitigation measures have been appropriate. In particular, stakeholders in Buriram have high awareness of the impacts of dry conditions on ESC and are working collaboratively on water management issues. This risk is ongoing.
Results Framework		
Risk to Objective indicators: Migratory species status is impacted by population levels outside of Thailand	-	As above.
The political situation in Thailand prevents effective national level discussion on a new bill or acceptance of a land use planning framework	-	As above.
That the economic situation within Thailand worsens limiting opportunities to obtain price premiums for environmentally friendly products		

The three species (which were selected during project development) provided some diversity of lessons and experiences; however, because two were bird species and all three occurred in wetland habitat, there were some limitations to this as a replication mechanism.

The knowledge management system was developed, containing information on ten target species (although with some shortcomings, as discussed in Section 3.3.1). As part of this, a database and GIS tool are linked to the ONEP biodiversity database, and ONEP will assume ownership of the database. This approach maximizes the likelihood that the knowledge management system will be used to share information and enable replication of the approaches used for the assessment of the ten species.

The largest weakness in delivery in regard to replication is the failure to deliver a national legislation and planning framework. This means that there is not a strong mechanism for replicating the provincial planning, land use planning and ES conservation planning that has been undertaken in the pilot provinces in the other provinces in Thailand. Nevertheless, some of the mechanisms used for the three species in the project may be appropriate for use for other species in other locations; for example, the issuance of a Provincial Order to protect Water Onion and its habitats in Ranong province could be replicated in other provinces to incorporate ES and critical habitat conservation into their provincial strategies and plans.

An additional useful tool for replication would have been for the project to develop a practical set of lessons and case studies that could be disseminated widely and supported by a training and capacity-building program. This could be supported by a policy or mechanism through which knowledge and experiences could be effectively shared.

3.1.6 UNDP Comparative Advantage

The UNDP comparative advantage in the implementation of the project lies in its long-standing experience addressing climate change, environmental sustainability and development in

and their relevance to the subject matter. As IP, ONEP had a lead role in all project outputs, while ZPO had a joint lead role for Output 2.2 (Long-term financial sustainability strategy for three ES habitats sites developed). ZPO has shown an ability to mobilize and engage partners from the private sector to support and sustain project activities after the project ends.

Most of the identified supporting agencies have been actively engaged in project implementation through various activities, including as members of the PB or k4(il)5(it)-2(y)10( )-12(tQT/F1 10.56 Tf1 0 0 8nc0.a(o)4(u-66(Ado)4(ri

In the original budget, there was co-financing of USD 100,000 from the Thailand Wetland Foundation; the evaluation team did not see evidence of a contribution from this group. Also, there was no co-financing budgeted from TEI or BCST, but they contributed USD 11,400 and USD 143,171 respectively.

Table 13 provides a breakdown of the confirmed sources of co-financing by name and type. In this table, the column Z d Ç ‰ -fi}(ancing [refers to whether the funding was a grant, loan, equity investment, public investment, guarantee, in-kind, or other; and the column Z / v À • š u v š D r e] r o] v whether the funding is investment mobilized (i.e. excluding recurrent expenditures) or recurrent expenditures (i.e. routine budgetary expenditures that fund the year-to-year core operations of the entity).

The evaluation team was provided with a detailed breakdown of each of these contributions as evidence of the co- ( ] v v] v P X d Z] • Á •] v š Z (} Œ u } (F i š Z Z i n g T e m p l a t e f o r G E F T r u s t F u n d } W Œ } i š • [(} Œ o o } v š Œ] µ h i g h e s t • c o n t r i b u t i o n s f r o m W o r l d B a n k . W h e r e s h o w n , more detailed information was provided in an MS Excel spreadsheet.

Confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and by type (USD)

GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	40,810
Recipient Country Government	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,051,918
Recipient Country Government	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP)	Other	Investment Mobilized	2,945,314
Recipient Country Government	Zoological Park Organization of Thailand (ZPO)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,624,200
Recipient Country Government	Zoological Park Organization of Thailand (ZPO)	Other	Investment Mobilized	2,133,270
Civil Society Organization	Bird Conservation Society of Thailand (BCST)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	127,200
Civil Society Organization	Bird Conservation Society of Thailand (BCST)	Other	Investment Mobilized	18,133
Civil Society Organization	Thailand Wetland Foundation	In-		

there were limited project activities occurring. The projects totaling USD 2,945,314 that are listed in Table 14 • Z] v À • š u v š u }] o] l a v a l u a b l e c o n t r i b u t i o n s t o t h i s ‰ Œ } i š [• µ o š] u š } i š] À X

3.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

Evidence

- µ M&E plan in project document was satisfactory
- µ PIRs were completed candidly and reflected real improvement in results in final year
- µ Inclusive and participatory approaches to monitoring used
- ¸ No gender considerations in M&E.02 665.5 Tm0 G[(P)-5(IRs)4( )10(we)8(r)-2(e)-2(co)7(m)4(pl)16(et)3(ed ca)3(neb

team is not aware of the Operational Focal Point (OFP) having been informed of M&E activities; the OFP did not contribute to PIR reporting.

The rating for M&E implementation is Moderately Satisfactory, because there were several moderate shortcomings noted (especially the absence of gender considerations in M&E, the lack of M&E discussion at the inception workshop, the deficiencies in follow-up of results framework changes, and the failure to set a baseline for the area of SBS habitat at Khok Kham).

3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partner Implementation / Execution

Evidence

- µ UNDP responded to a significant implementation problem with an effective solution
- µ UNDP and ONEP had results-focused approach
- µ Substantial co-financing realized from ONEP
- ¸ Little sign of ONEP as IP proactively progressing project during extensive delay
- ¸ Change in priority for ONEP where ES Bill not developed had negative impact on deliverables
- ¸ Some inefficiencies for other parties working with UNDP administrative and financial systems

There was consistent support to the IP and project team by UNDP throughout project implementation. The project faced a challenge when the project manager departed after the first year, and UNDP was responsive to this significant implementation problem. In consultation with ONEP, UNDP identified an appropriate solution involving recruitment of an RP to manage the project. Although there was a long delay that had an impact on project performance, the evaluation team understands that UNDP went to great lengths to fill the role efficiently.

UNDP sat on the PB and played an active role in meetings. Regular meetings between UNDP, ONEP and the RP (IUCN) were held to discuss management issues, including adaptive management measures. A UNDP programme assistant was in charge of day-to-day coordination with ONEP and RP on administrative matters.

UNDP Country Office (CO) provided substantial support to the project, especially in procurement, recruitment of service and goods providers, and organizing meetings and workshops. The costs incurred by UNDP CO in providing these support services were recovered from the project management line of the project budget.

The RTA played a strong technical support role, including providing clarification on technical concepts in the project document when required, advice on matters relating to the achievement of project outcomes, and guidance on adaptive management approaches and procedures.

The evaluation team heard from ONEP and IUCN during interviews that UNDP was responsive and that the quality and timeliness of h E Wt technical support to the project team was satisfactory. However, challenges were reported resulting from poor alignment between government and UNDP administrative rules and procedures, and a lack of clarity around some UNDP procedures, which caused inefficiencies and delayed approval of some activities that needed joint decision and action.

UNDP had a results-based focus on project implementation, which was perceived as useful by the IP and other stakeholders interviewed. Reporting by the CO and RTA was candid and realistic, especially in the annual PIRs, as described under Section 3.2.5.

3.3 PjectRels

3.3.1

protection has not yet been assured in these three provinces (as per the wording of the indicator), although steps are in place.

In Ranong province, a Provincial Order has been issued to protect Water Onion and its habitats, and in Phang Nga province, Water Onion habitats are protected under a MONRE Ministerial Order (2016).

In Khok Kham, SBS habitat is currently protected under several laws/measures, including the National Conserved Forest Act, Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act (as a non-hunting area), and the Cabinet Resolution on 1 August 2000 and 3 November 2009 that identifies the area as a wetland of national importance with 16 protection measures.

Status of species on the National Red list	Thailand currently has 1,058 species identified as		

The ES management and monitoring system is operational and contains information on the ten target species. The database and GIS tool are linked to the ONEP biodiversity database and ONEP will assume ownership of the database when it is completed, which is appropriate.

This is rated as ØPartially achieved [because conservation and recovery plans have not been developed.

Water Onion exported at Suvarnabhumi Airport (data source: Plant Quarantine Department at Suvarnabhumi Airport)

3.3.2 Relevance

At the time of development, the project was very relevant to local and national priorities and to ONEP organizational priorities.

GEF programming

The project was highly consistent with GEF BD-2 Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes, seascapes, and sectors. [

Indicator 2: Number of climate-related policies and model actions established applied and/or replicated by national and local partners; as well as exchanged in south-south cooperation forums.

Baseline: As of 2011, no strong climate-related national policies and model actions established, applied and/or replicated by national and local partners.

Target: At least 3 climate-related policies and model actions established, applied and/or replicated by 2016 with support by UNDP. At least 3 south-south exchange forums conducted addressing the three outputs and other key issues (e.g. mitigation, adaptation, environmental security, climate fiscal framework, etc.).

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area - UNDP Strategic Plan (2014 t2018): Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development.

outcomes/findings into existing policies after the project ends, and the second was comments on the policy recommendations proposed by the project). These documents have specifically considered the work prepared by IUCN, TEI and BCST.

3.3.5 Mainstreaming

The project document provided a good framework and indicative activities for mainstreaming gender throughout the project, including during the inception, implementation and M&E phases (p 52). Gender-specific activities were identified for each outcome indicator. To ensure gender mainstreaming, a gender analysis was proposed as part of the inception phase and a session of the inception workshop was to focus on gender issues.

The evaluation team found that some attention had been given to gender equality in participation in project activities, both in decision-making and operational roles, and that some sex-disaggregated data had

xx

4 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

4.1 Conclusions

This project has led to valuable advancements in the understanding of planning and implementation for the protection of endangered species in Thailand, especially in production landscapes.

The most notable achievements have been under Outcome 2, demonstrating critical habitat management for three ES. The project has worked with communities

}(•‰] • µŒŒ všoÇ o]•š }v šZ E did not meet SMART criteria and was unrealistic for the project.

Considering the difficult nature of both indicators, the evaluation team considered that moderate progress had been made towards the Objective and assigned a rating of

dZ Œ Á Œ o]u]š š]}v•]v šZ Æš vš š} ÁZ] Z P v Œ }v•] Œ š]}v• Á implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Despite a strong framework for this being established in the project document, there was no gender analysis undertaken during inception or implementation and no systematic process to include gender-specific indicators within all monitoring and evaluation activities (although some sex-disaggregated information on participation in activities was collected). In spite of these (]] v] •U šZ À oµ š]}v š u (}µv šZ š šZ o À o }(Á}u v[• ‰ Œš implementation of project activities was relatively high, especially in communities where pilot activities were occurring. This appeared to have occurred naturally rather than via a planned process. The project did not use a gender specialist during the inception or implementation stages; the use of such a specialist would have ensured that gender mainstreaming was explicitly built into project implementation.

4.2 Recommendations

This section presents recommendations for the project, with an explanation of each that outlines the evaluation tea u[• Œ o À vš }v oµ•]}v• v Œ š]}v o (}Œ šZ Œ }uu v š]}vX

Technical and other support should continue to be provided to the communities with endangered species learning centers in Samut Sakhon, Ranong and Phang Nga

The ES learning centers established during the project provide important opportunities to raise awareness about the target species and biodiversity conservation and are an important component of the approach to ensuring sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluation team was impressed with the enthusiasm of the local people about the learning centers and their potential to attract tourism to their communities.

The evaluation team heard concerns expressed by community members at Samut Sakhon, Ranong and Phang Nga about the sustainability of the learning centers after completion of the project, particularly because the centers have been only recently opened. Support that is needed includes help with the means to cover routine expenses (especially with power and water costs), technical (ensuring that community members have up-to-date and accurate understanding of the subject matter) and logistical (scheduling and managing visitors and activities).

The ESC learning center at Buriram already has significant ongoing support, including from ZPO, Mahidol University and local busine5(h)14(e 4/F1 10..0 g0 G5I869..f4(n)]TJ286.85 Tm0 d)-8(lea)14(r)-2(ni)5(ng)7( )-46(ce)12(nt)8(er

The legislative review document prepared by the project does not address these matters. Given the extenteview document

the GEF. In this project, the project document was very detailed and prescriptive about the legislation and land use planning framework that was to be developed, and specifically committed to a bill being approved by Cabinet. This created immediate implementation challenges when ONEP determined early that such a bill was no longer a priority. Further, the project assessed the likelihood of approval of the ES legislation] v P o Ç , which is an unrealistic assessment. Care should be taken in project development that legislative development components are flexible and realistic.

Long-term involvement delivers robust results

ZPO were involved in this project during development and from inception to completion. The work on ESC in Buriram province shows the benefits of such long-term involvement: strong community support, innovative rice product development with local farmers, coordination across agencies and groups, and financial commitment from local businesses. This means that the results are deep-rooted and likely to be sustainable, and all ESC targets were met.

Another benefit of this long-term involvement in a community-based project lies in the culture of ZPO. The evaluation team heard that the organization has learned the importance of working with local communities W Z t µ • š } Á } Œ l Á] š Z v] u o • U v } Á Á Á } Œ l Á] š Z ‰ } ‰ o [X

Engagement of a Responsible Party for project delivery can result in efficient achievement of results

When this project commenced, a project manager was engaged by and reported to UNDP. This project manager departed a short time into the project and there were then long delays in trying to fill this role, during which time little progress occurred in the project. UNDP and ONEP decided to instead engage an organization as a Responsible Party (RP) to deliver large components of the project. IUCN were engaged as RP, and they appointed project staff who sat in ONEP and reported to IUCN. The result was that the project made good progress in its final year and went from being off track in 2018 to being on track in 2019 and achieving significant results by project completion.

There were pros and cons to this arrangement.

The main nt res2y

Annexes

Annex 1. Mission itinerary and list of persons interviewed

Annex 2. Summary of field visits

Annex 3. List of documents reviewed

Annex 4. Evaluation Question Matrix

Annex 5. Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

Annex 6. Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)

Annex 7. Signed Terminal Evaluation Final Report Clearance Form

Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft TE report

Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF tracking tool

Morning	Afternoon

Debriefing with ONEP, IUCN, TEI and ZPO at ONEP office: x Ms Sukanya Wisan x Ms Wilailak Suraphruk x Ms On-iriya Fugthaworn x Ms Phuangphaka Khaokratoke x Mr Alongkorn Wongman x Ms Yenta Nungvaewdaeng x Ms Natsuda Suwatthanabunpot	Debriefing with UNDP at UNDP office: x Mr Renaud Meyer, Resident Representative x Mr Saengroj Srisawaskraisorn x Ms Yenta Nungvaewdaeng x Ms Natsuda Suwatthanabunpot

Water Onion: Ranong and Phang Nga (23-25 September 2019)

In Ranong, the evaluation team met with the Director of PONRE and was briefed on project activities in the province, including the issuance of a Provincial Order on Water Onion Habitat Zoning and Conservation Measures, the establishment of a Project Provincial Advisory Committee and the Water Onion learning center, and the inclusion of a Water Onion conservation budget in the 2020 Provincial Plan. Issues around the sustainability of project benefits and initiatives were discussed.

The evaluation team then

26. Excel file containing records of Spoon-billed Sandpiper in Thailand

Documents by KW Solutions

27. Reports on database of endangered species (includes link to public website with species information: http://chff.onep.go.th/)

Documents by Silpakorn University

28. Report: The Evaluation of } u u µ v] š Ç [• W } š v š] o • v E • (} Œ ^ µ • š] v o À

Was project support provided in an efficient way?	Evaluation findings regarding support, implementation, adaptive management, results-based management, financing and co-financing	Quarterly reports, PIRs, PB minutes, back to office reports, stakeholder interviews	Desktop review, interviews
Did the project deliver satisfactory results for the budget spent?	Achievement of outcomes assessed against cost	PIR, quarterly reports, financing and co-financing, PB minutes, stakeholder interviews, MTR	Desktop review, interviews, field visits
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	Findings regarding efficiency	PIRs, quarterly reports, project document, stakeholder interviews	Desktop review, interviews

Evaluators/Consultants:
1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice U u] v] u] Ì u v • } v š] u U v Œ • ‰ š ‰ } ‰ o [• Œ] P Z š v } š ‰ } ‰ o [• Œ] P Z š š } ‰ Œ } À]] v (} Œ u š] } v] v } v ( ] v U v u µ • š traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the

Evaluators/Consultants:
1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands

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 TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The Consultant will report to the assigned UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor Ecosystems and Biodiversity for Asia and the Pacific and Team Leader of the Inclusive Green Growth and Sustainable Development (IGSD) Unit of UNDP Thailand Country Office.

The total duration of the contract will be approximately 24 working days from plan from 1 September -25 December 2019:

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to Bangkok and the project sites in Buriram, Ranong, Phang Nga and Samut Sakhon, Thailand. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
25 July -7 August 2019	Advertisement
7 August 2019	Application Close
8-31 August 2019	Select TE Team/contract issuance process
1 September 2019	Contract begins Prep the TE Team (handover of Project Documents)
10 September 2019 (4 working days)	Project Document Review Document Review, preparing TE inception Report
20 September 2019	Finalization and Validation of the TE Inception Report and re-submit to UNDP.
22 September 2019	TE Mission: Arrival in Bangkok of International Evaluation Team Lead
23-27 September 2019 (5 working days)	Inception meeting at UNDP Country Office

- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

- Analytic Capacity and demonstrated ability to process, analyse and synthesize complex, technical information.
- Proven ability to support the development of high quality knowledge and training materials, and to train technical teams;
- Prove experience in the developing country context and working in different cultural settings.

- Communicate effectively in writing to a varied and board audience in a simple and concise manner

- Capable of working in a high pressure environment with sharp and frequent deadlines, managing many tasks simultaneously;
- Excellent analytical and organisational skills

- Project a positive image and is ready to take on a wide range of tasks;
- Focuses on results for the client;
- Welcomes constructive feedback

The evaluation team will be composed of an International and a national evaluat.

- Documentation and review
- Leading the TE team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalisation of the Terminal Evaluation report

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC´s duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

%	Milestone
10%	Upon submission of TE inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed. Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. The provided living allowance will not be exceeding UNDP DSA rates. Repatriation travel cost from home to duty station in Bangkok and return shall not be covered by UNDP.

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method t where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price

proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score š Z š Z • o • } ‰ šneral Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the total technical points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

/ v š Œ • š] v] À] µ o } v • µ o š v š • u µ • š • µ u] š š Z (} o o } Á] v P } µ u v š their qualifications; Please group them into one1) single PDF document as the application only allows to upload maximum on document:

a using the template provided by UNDP

b indicating all past experiences from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

c) of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

	70%	700
- D • š Œ [• P Œ Natural Sciences, Environmental Management, Environmental Studies, Development studies, Social Sciences and/or other related fields.	10%	100
- Monitoring and evaluation experience in the project on environmental, nature conservation, land use planning, biodiversity management in Thailand (for national consultant), -no country	30%	300

specific for international consultant		
- Competence in data analytic and visualization techniques	20%	200
- Competency in Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal.	10%	100

The project was designed to mainstream the conservation of globally important and endangered biodiversity into the management of production landscapes through improved management of critical habitats. At the national level, it will develop a legislative, regulatory and enforcement framework to guide endangered species (ES) and critical habitat conservation and management. This will be supported by 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.

These approaches will be piloted for three species namely the Eastern Sarus Crane (Grus antigone sharpii), the Spoon-billed Sandpiper (Eurynorhynchus pygmeus) and the Water Lily (Crinum thaianum) in three distinct geographical locations. Within each location the project will also build 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.

4-16 October 2019 (10 working days)	Preparing draft TE report
17 October 2019 (0 working days for consultant)	Circulation of draft report with draft management response template for comments and completion
18- October to 19 November 2019 (3 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedbacks on draft report/Finalization of TE report including Management Responses
20 November 2019	Submission of final TE report

- u}v•šŒš•]vš PŒ]šÇ Çu} o]vP šZ hE[•Àoµ•v šZ]o•š
- Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

- Analytic Capacity and demonstrated ability to process, analyse and synthesize complex, technical information.
- Proven ability to support the development of high-quality knowledge and training materials, and to train technical teams;
- Prove experience in the developing country context and working in different cultural settings.

- Communicate effectively in writing to a varied and board audience in a simple and concise manner

- Capable of working in a high-pressure environment with sharp and frequent deadlines, managing many tasks simultaneously;
- Excellent analytical and organisational skills

- Project a positive image and is ready to take on a wide range of tasks;
- Focuses on results for the client;
- Welcomes constructive feedback

- Minimum of 8 years accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and management,

and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed. Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. The provided living allowance will not be exceeding UNDP Living Allowance rates.

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method t where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score š Z š Z • o • } ‰ š h E W [• ' v Œ o d Œ u • v } v] š] } v • Á] o o Á

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the total technical points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

/ v š Œ • š] v] À] µ o } v • µ o š v š • u µ • š • µ u] š š Z (} o o } Á] v P } µ u v š
their qualifications; Please group them into one1) single PDF document as the application only allows to upload maximum on document:

a using the template provided by UNDP

b indicating all past experiences from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

c) of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

	70%	700
- D • š Œ [• P Œ Natural Sciences, Environmental Management, Environmental Studies, Development studies, Social Sciences and/or other related fields.	10%	100
- Monitoring and evaluation experience in the project on environmental, nature conservation, land use planning, biodiversity management in Thailand (for national consultant), -no country specific for international consultant	30%	300
- Competence in data analytic and visualization techniques	20%	200
- Competency in Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal	10%	100
	30%	300

All application materials should be submitted to UNDP The