

Terminal Evaluation:

Strengthening urban forestry demonstration site of Bang Kachao (Thailand) for biodiversity conservation and natural learning centre [2012P1-THA]

Asia-Pacific Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation (APFNet)

Submitted to:

Zhuo Yu Fang

Programme Officer

zhuo_yufang@apfnet.cn

Asia-Pacific Network for Sustainable
Forest Management and Rehabilitation
(APFNet)

6th Floor, Building A, Baoneng Center
No.12, Fu Tong Dong Da Jie Beijing
100102, P.R. China

Document number:

CFL 19-004-002c

Towards completion of agreement:

APFNet-SERVICE-2019-043

Date:

30 May 2019



Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| Introduction and scope of work | 7 |
| Evaluation design and implementation | 8 |
| Findings and Analysis | 11 |
| Evaluation results and conclusions | 13 |
| Recommendations and lessons learned | 14 |
| References | 15 |
| Annex I: Evaluation agenda | 16 |
| Annex II: Project progress table | 17 |
| Annex III: Project overall rating table..... | 19 |
| Annex IV: Questionnaires for data collection..... | 21 |
| Annex V: List of interviewees | 22 |

Acronyms

Table 1: List of acronyms used in this document.

| | |
|--------|---|
| APFNet | Asia-Pacific Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation |
| CFL | Climate Forestry Limited |
| EA | Executing Agency |
| PPT | Petroleum Authority of Thailand |
| RFD | Royal Forestry Department |
| TE | Terminal Evaluator |

Acknowledgements

The Terminal Evaluator would like to thank APFNet for supporting this work and specifically, the project officers whom worked so diligently to ensure a smooth and worry-free evaluation. The Terminal Evaluation would also like to thank the Royal Forestry Department for their support in facilitating this evaluation.

Executive Summary

Broadly, this project completed the objectives outlined in project proposal, dated September 2012; namely, 1) The establishment of a demonstration and learning site; 2) Developing and promoting biodiversity conservation through linking the number of visitors and the income flow of the local people; 3) Maximising the potential of the area as an ecotourism attraction by improving the habitat for dependent flora and fauna species; and 4) Increasing public outreach through developing a project information site (RFD 2012). The TE found the EA completed Output 1 successfully, i.e., Establishment of demonstration and learning site for interested groups and visitors. Namely this included the following, and partially Outputs 2: Establishment of biodiversity conservation area through ecotourism channels to achieve an increase in visitor numbers as well as in the income flow to the local people; Output 3: The maximised ecotourism attraction of the project site by improving the habitat for dependent flora and fauna species; and, Output 4: The available project information for public outreach.

The following Activities were carried out successfully:

Activity 1.1: Establishing an exhibition and interpretative centre

Activity 1.2: Maintaining the character and value of the project site for ecotourism

Activity 1.3: Implementing a natural conservation and urban forestry programme as part of the curriculum for local school children

Activity 1.4: Encouraging local volunteers and youth groups involve the education

Activity 2.1: Developing facilities of the project site to provide more extensive experience to visitors

Activity 2.3: Training the local people as tour guides

Activity 3.1: Developing conservation sites for feeding endemic fauna

Activity 4.1: Documenting the project information

The TE is of the opinion the following Activities are incomplete:

Activity 2.2: Marketing the Bang Kachao site to potential visitors. No evidence was presented to demonstrate the results of the secondary data investigation of behaviour of tourists and visitors to Bang Kachao and marketing plan.

Activity 3.1: Developing conservation sites for feeding endemic fauna. No evidence was provided to demonstrate the results of the ecological baseline survey.

Activity 4.2: Reporting. Issues related to inconsistency and transparency evident across the reports and evidence provided.

Over the project timeline, the project was suspended multiple times: namely, 1) November 2013 and October 2014 due to political instability in Thailand (RFD 2019); 2) August 2014 to October 2014 due to stakeholder confidence in the project (RFD 2016); 3) November 2015 to April 2016 due to disbursement regulations of RFD (RFD 2017). This timeline was compiled by reviewing all documents received from APFNet representing various reports over the project duration. Ideally, the Executing Agency (EA) should summarise the project

timeline in the final report to clearly outline the progress of the project and the challenges faced over the implementation period, not the Terminal Evaluator (TE). The TE found inconsistencies in reporting by the EA, with no evidence found in the delivery of select reports stated in the original reporting schedule, i.e., Year 1 Quarterly Progress 3 Report, Year 1 Quarterly Progress 4 Report (RFD 2013). Evidence of Work Plans were found to represent June 2016 to May 2017, the Project Progress Report dated June 2018, and a Work Plan representing February to December 2018 only. In many of the reports, the text was repetitive and, in some cases, redundant, making reading and understanding of Activities challenging i.e., in the Project Progress Report text from Output 2 is the exact text as Activity 2.1. In some reports, not all details were presented, or information was excluded, i.e., a summary of findings from the forest inventory or the 'BioBlitz'. During the Terminal Evaluation, the TE was told by the EA that 50,000 trees were planted in the APFNet area over the project period. However, no evidence could be produced to substantiate this statement, i.e., work plan, maps, GPS location of trees, tree tags, etc. No additional evidence was presented to indicate the monies provided by APFNet were used in the manner to which they were allocated, i.e., no third-party audited accounts produced.

Despite repeated delays, limited documentation, insufficient monitoring and limited transparency of financial flows, this project has achieved great success. The success of this project lies with the people who conceptualised, established and facilitate the field demonstration centre. Hosting (an unverified) 50 visitors per week, the demonstration site boasts knowledgeable and friendly staff whom are on-hand to explain to visitors the importance of using native tree species for local applications. For example, during the Terminal Evaluation, a group from PTT visited the site to learn about the project and participate in the creation of local products, i.e., scarfs and tea. It became clear to the TE that the staff conducted their work with passion, friendliness and appreciation of the time the visitors had taken to join them at the demonstration site. This could be seen in the response by all visitors whereby smiles, questions and importantly, the transfer of knowledge occurred from the facilitator to the visitor, with all parties leaving the demonstration site with apparent satisfaction. While there is no measure to happiness and satisfaction, the TE believes the visitors enjoyed themselves. This is because the TE has asked his colleagues and friends about their experiences in tourism in Bang Kachao and the general feedback was extremely positive. While none of those friends specifically visited the APFNet site, the area as a whole was well received by the general public, and this sentiment can only support the results of the successes of this APFNet project.

Another major achievement of this project was the creation of the Biodiversity Survey Guideline for use by the children of neighbouring schools and visitors. The guidelines were written to attract the attention and curiosity of young students to approach vegetative surveys by applying a logical flow of activities. This begins by understanding the objectives of the survey, to recording and tagging trees, to preserving leaf samples for future reference. This reference text can have a significant impact on the long-term understanding of the importance of local tree species to local community knowledge relative to their use and significance to the people.

Introduction and scope of work

Since 2008, the RFD has promoted an urban forestry programme on a small island of approximately 2,000 ha called “Bang Kachao”. The island is located in Samut Prakarn province which is approximately 10 km from the Bangkok city centre and is surrounded by a 15 km length of the Chao Phraya River, a major river of the central plain. The location is 20 km away from the Gulf of Thailand supports a unique ecosystem resulting from the combination of fresh, salt and brackish water. Such an ecosystem means that the area has some of the richest biodiversity in the last lowland area of the central plain that has survived urban expansion. Although there have been more than 20,000 inhabitants within the area for more than 500 years, 80% of the area is still covered by vegetation. In 1987, the government declared this area a green conservation area and purchased nearly 600 parcels of land or approximately 10% of the area from local inhabitants. The largest parcel of land is approximately 25 ha and has been used to establish a city park called “Srinakhorn Khuan Kahn City Park” managed by the RFD which has established the management unit headquarters there. Up to the present, the area has gained a reputation with the public for its natural beauty and well-preserved traditional and normal way of life of the local people. Ecotourism activities such as cycling through the area and boat cruising for sight-seeing in the daytime and observing the fireflies in the nighttime, are popular. Due to its location close to Bangkok and a well-served road network, a large number of visitors’ flock to the area during weekends. In 2009, more than 7,000 local tourists and 3,000 international visitors from 25 economies across the world visited the area monthly. As a result, the area was recognised by Time Magazine as the “Best Urban Oasis of Asia” in 2006. Since 2008, the area has also been designated as the major site for demonstrating the urban forestry programme of the RFD to interested groups. The overall goal of this project is to maximise biodiversity conservation and strengthen the urban forestry programme through a demonstration site and learning centre including ecotourism promotion and benefits to local communities.

In accordance with Asia-Pacific Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation (APFNet) Guidelines for Project Monitoring and Evaluation (APFNet 2019), projects supported by APFNet require mid-term and terminal evaluations. The purpose of the evaluations is to ensure the project meets the pre-identified objectives and deliverables as well as providing recommendations to improve the planning, implementation and management of APFNet projects. Terminal evaluations are conducted upon completion of a project to assess whether the goal(s) and objectives are met effectively and whether an extension is required and implemented by an independent assessor assigned by APFNet.

APFNet engaged Climate Forestry Limited (CFL) as the independent assessor to review of the following APFNet project and concentrate on the following project components (RFD 2019):

- (1) The establishing of demonstration and learning site for interested groups and visitors;
- (2) The improvement of biodiversity conservation area and habitat for endemic flora and fauna species in Bang Kachao;
- (3) The increasing of income flow of local people through maximization of the ecotourism attraction;

As outlined in APFNet (2018), this Terminal Evaluations aims to undertake the following:

- Assess whether the goal(s) and objectives of the project are met and whether an extension is required;
- Provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements of APFNet;
- Assess the efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability of the project;
- Promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned;
- Summarise the achievements of the project and assess how they can be sustained;
- Identify lessons-learned related to the implementation of the project for future project formulation and implementation.

Evaluation design and implementation

In accordance with the APFNet Guidelines for Project Monitoring and Evaluation (APFNet 2018), this terminal evaluation focused on the following methods and approaches:

Relevance of the design of the project:

Reviewing the links between project design and annual planning is essential to ensure project activities, outputs and objectives are inter-related, as well as determining whether indicators actually measure achievement(s). Moreover, investigating the design of the project is important to measure the flexibility of the management and the ability to adapt to changes over time.

Efficiency:

Project-based efficiency is estimated using several indicators such as: a) Financial Management: How well financial resources were planned, controlled and executed; b) Cost Effectiveness: How resources, expertise and time are actualized into results; c) Monitoring and evaluation, documentation and reporting: How effective were meetings, discussions, monitors and evaluations; d) The performance of project management and implementation bodies: Evaluating the effectiveness of project staff and upper-management of the project; e) Stakeholder participation and public awareness: How the project was communicated to immediate and local stakeholders as well as introducing the work to the public.

Effectiveness:

APFNet project evaluations apply result-oriented indicators by applying the ‘with-without, and before-after’ approach. This is completed by the assessor reviewing the project as a whole before it is implemented and the activities and outputs at the completion of the project. Specifically, APFNet examines the achievements that are relative to the activities and the relevance to support how the project objectives, outputs and outcomes are achieved.

Impacts:

Project-based impacts are measured based on a set of indicators examining initial positive and negative impacts as well as secondary long-term effects, whether directly or indirectly intended that affects economic, environmental, cultural and social aspects. Specifically, APFNet examines impact indicators on stakeholders, ecological function of the forest and forest management.

Sustainability and duplicability:

APFNet examines whether the project brought about positive impacts, whether the project has the potential to increase in area in a similar political, economic, social and cultural environment, and whether the project can self-sustain without further funding resources. APFNet further examines where the project can be duplicated and scaled-up at the state/provincial, regional or international level. The following Outputs were used to evaluate the project and the criteria and indicators are outlined in [Table 2](#):

1. The establishment of a demonstration and learning site;
2. The improvement of biodiversity conservation and habitat for endemic flora and fauna species in Bang Kachao;
3. The increase of income flow of local people through ecotourism;
4. The availability of project information for the public.

Table 2: Criteria and indicators applied for the Bang Kachao project.

| Output | Criteria | Indicator |
|---|--|---|
| Output 1: Establishment of demonstration and learning site for interested groups and visitors | | |
| 1.1 | The establishment of a demonstration and learning site | Physical site office, demonstration centre, learning signboards, meeting rooms |
| 1.2 | Maintaining the character and value of the project site to help develop ecotourism | Appropriate areas of interest for exhibition and activities |
| 1.3 | Implementing a natural conservation and urban forestry programme as part of the curriculum of local schoolchildren | Meetings with stakeholders and the development of curriculum |
| 1.4 | Encouraging local volunteers and youth groups to become involved in education programmes | Completion of training programmes |
| Output 2: Establishment of biodiversity conservation area and development of this through ecotourism channels to achieve an increase in visitor numbers as well as in the flow of income benefiting local people | | |
| 2.1 | Developing project site facilities to provide visitors with a more immersive experience | Consultative meetings between ecotourism expert team and communities |
| 2.2 | Marketing the Bang Kachao site to potential visitors | Conduct market research and develop marketing plans and strategies |
| 2.3 | Training local people as tour guides | Meeting minutes of training seminars |
| Output 3: Maximizing the site's ecotourism potential by improving the habitat of dependent flora and fauna in the area | | |
| 3.1 | Developing conservation sites to support endemic fauna | Collection of baseline information for site selection and meetings to decide on final locations |
| 3.2 | Maximizing the biodiversity of the project site | Implement ecological surveys and make decisions based on management and stakeholder consultations |
| Output 4: Increasing public outreach through developing project information | | |
| 4.1 | Documenting project information | Creation of an information log and database |
| 4.2 | Reporting | Publications and promotional material |

Findings and Analysis

Broadly, this project completed the objectives outlined in project proposal, dated September 2012; namely, 1) The establishment of a demonstration and learning site; 2) Developing and promoting biodiversity conservation through linking the number of visitors and the income flow of the local people; 3) Maximising the potential of the area as an ecotourism attraction by improving the habitat for dependent flora and fauna species; and 4) Increasing public outreach through developing a project information site (RFD 2012).

The TE found the EA completed Output 1 successfully, i.e., Establishment of demonstration and learning site for interested groups and visitors. Namely this included the following, and partially Outputs 2: Establishment of biodiversity conservation area through ecotourism channels to achieve an increase in visitor numbers as well as in the income flow to the local people; Output 3: The maximised ecotourism attraction of the project site by improving the habitat for dependent flora and fauna species; and, Output 4: The available project information for public outreach.

The following Activities were carried out successfully:

Activity 1.1: Establishing an exhibition and interpretative centre

Activity 1.2: Maintaining the character and value of the project site for ecotourism

Activity 1.3: Implementing a natural conservation and urban forestry programme as part of the curriculum for local school children

Activity 1.4: Encouraging local volunteers and youth groups involve the education

Activity 2.1: Developing facilities of the project site to provide more extensive experience to visitors

Activity 2.3: Training the local people as tour guides

Activity 3.1: Developing conservation sites for feeding endemic fauna

Activity 4.1: Documenting the project information

The TE is of the opinion the following Activities are incomplete:

Activity 2.2: Marketing the Bang Kachao site to potential visitors. No evidence was presented to demonstrate the results of the secondary data investigation of behaviour of tourists and visitors to Bang Kachao and marketing plan.

Activity 3.1: Developing conservation sites for feeding endemic fauna. No evidence was provided to demonstrate the results of the ecological baseline survey.

Activity 4.2: Reporting. Issues related to inconsistency and transparency evident across the reports and evidence provided.

The APFNet consists of a maximum of 10% of the net area of the urban park. It is understood during the first suspension timeframe that the EA engaged with the private-sector to allocate areas for corporate sponsorship. This was evident during the site visit by the TE with the EA bringing the group to the area sponsored by Petroleum Authority of Thailand (PPT), a national energy corporation with a primary mission to expedite the procurement of adequate oil for domestic consumption. With signboards across the site, including manicured road 'islands' with corporate logos, it is understood by the TE that the

Bang Kachao site is an urban park funded primarily by PPT, with sponsorships of SBCG and Deutsche Bahn (DB) visible in and around the area. Primarily, this is due to display of corporate logos on information signboards. Members of the Terminal Evaluation Team from APFNet requested more effort from the EA to install the logo of APFNet. The PPT site has a paved pathway and bicycles for visitors to use to learn more about the area, flora and fauna.

The APFNet site is situated in a separate area and it seems lesser known. This is because it is not possible to arrive via vehicle, but visitors must walk 10 minutes to reach the site. With the APFNet logo only found in the resource and learning centre, the sponsorship and significance of the project is not clear to the visitor. However, after learning about the Activities and cultural aspects, the TE believes visitors will understand the importance of the project. This is primarily due to the engagement with the Ban Mai community, the involvement of local schools, the establishment of the demonstration and learning site and the instillation of the resource centre. It is understood the APFNet project receives 50 visitors per week, resulting in 2,600 visitors per year. Given the scale of the impact based on such a small budget, the TE believes the goal of the application is achieved. This also demonstrates the impact of the marketing campaign by the EA demonstrating their commitment to the success of the APFNet project.

The innovation of the project stems from the people directly engaged with its implementation. Evidence was found in the innovation of the ecotourism activities at the visitor centre. Activities such as: 1) using local tree species to extract oils to dye and colour clothing and scarves; 2) extracting oils from local species and creating soap; 3) using local coconuts to serve visitors drinks; 4) using local species for the creation of non-caffeine tea; 5) growing local herbs for use in food provided to tourists; and 6) the extract of oils from forest species for use during 'local' foot massage. During the evaluation, the TE engaged directly with Dr Aroomsri Auestiwong, an advisor to the project, who explained that none of these activities were 'traditional', but they were invented for this project using local knowledge of the forest species and innovative thinking. The TE believes this has been an excellent contribution to the project. This is because when people are encouraged to bring their ideas into a project, they are genuinely engaged in the success of the project. The same occurred in this project with excellent results. It is very likely that the innovation of this project can be duplicated in other sites across Thailand.

Little evidence was provided to the TE regarding how the inventory of flora and fauna in Activity 3.1 took place, leading to questions of representativeness and good science practice. As outlined in the Project Final Report 2019 (RFD 2019), 'Bioblitz' was conducted over a 24-hour period with no further information provided. Moreover, no evidence was provided to demonstrate how the vegetative survey plots were identified, established, or how the data was collected, and no evidence was provided with the outputs of the investigation. Coupled with the inability of the EA to provide evidence regarding the growth and planting of 50,000 native tree seedlings informs the TE that little attention was made to procedures, best-practice and critically, monitoring and reporting of project activities over time.

Evaluation results and conclusions

The TE found the EA completed Activity 1.1-1.4, Activity 2.1, 2.3, Activity 3.1 and Activity 4.1. The TE is of the opinion that: a) Activity 2.2 is incomplete as no evidence was presented to demonstrate the results of the secondary data investigation of behaviour of tourists and visitors to Bang Kachao and marketing plan; b) Activity 3.1 is incomplete as no evidence was provided to demonstrate the results of the ecological baseline survey; c) Activity 4.2 is outstanding with issues related to inconsistency and transparency evident across the reports and evidence provided. As mentioned in previous sections, there is room for improvement in the management, implementation and reporting in this project. Despite the reoccurring delay in the implementation of this project, the submission of reports should have been tightly monitored to ensure the project, albeit it delayed, was on-going. It was understood by the TE that the Terminal Assessment was initiated by APFNet and not the EA, indicating the project exceeded the acceptable time limit by APFNet. While APFNet cannot control the delays outlined earlier in this report, it can apply more frequent monitoring such that delays are minimised, and project-based activities are completed on schedule. As such, this section should not be limited to discussing the EA, rather the monitoring body also has a role to play in the implementation and management of successful projects.

Specifically regarding the EA, the project proposal outlines a comprehensive structure to the organisation of this project and this was reiterated in the Annual Work Plan 2013 (RFD 2013). Ideally this structure should be summarised in the Project Final Report 2019 (RFD 2019) such that the TE can follow APFNet guidance for project evaluation which applies the format of 'before and after' project, to understand the impact of the project over time (APFNet 2018). Insufficient evidence was provided to the TE to determine whether the management structure and procedures for the project were appropriate for the desired outcome.

Despite the delays and the lack of baseline documents, management plans and procedures, the project seems to have been successfully implemented as is evident through the completion of the visitor centre and the 200 monthly visitors. However, the TE did not see any evidence to verify the actual number of visitors over the project period. Daily attendance records are required to demonstrate the number of visitors.

A work plan was found for the Activities of Year 1 (RFD 2013), Year 2 (RFD 2017), and again for Year 2 (RFD 2018). The two plans found for Year 2 are similar with the later stating in detail the status of various Activities over the period. However, both express the same budget demonstrating challenges to distinguish what was accomplished during in the first and second Work Plan of Year 2. The TE believes that closer project monitoring by APFNet should have raised this issue such that detailed planning could be reflected in the second Work Plan of Year 2.

While a budget was allocated in both Work Plans for Year 2, the TE did not uncover or review any evidence of third-party audited accounts for the project, on a year-on-year basis, or for the entire project as a whole. The TE found it difficult to follow the project, how money was spent, and no evidence was provided to verify monies were spent on project-based costs. Closer observation is recommended to be undertaken by APFNet to ensure project Activities are completed in a timely and transparent manner.

Recommendations and lessons learned

This project has the potential for replication, albeit, with better documentation and transparency. The framework of this project boasts innovation at the local level to increase awareness of the forest and species types to support local communities both financially and socially. As Thailand has a moratorium on logging for the time-being, restoration and innovative sustainable extractive-use programmes can support local knowledge and tourism in multiple locations throughout the economy. Projects should be localised to showcase the natural surroundings to develop the best possible programme for tourists, visitors and school groups. Future projects could focus specifically on clear phases of work to separate the creation of literature and the implementation of ground-based operations to efficiently implement programmes. Dissemination of project-based material could be in conjunction with 'open day' at select government departments or be held in major shopping complexes to increase the outreach of the material. The association with newspapers, magazines, journals or periodic publications can also support to raise awareness on the impacts of the project, and articles should be encouraged for publication in various mediums. Interviews with project managers can also help to boost the dissemination of project results including showcasing on talk radio and television talk shows and news channels.

The implementation of the various project Activities, how they were reported and the accuracy of those reports, including financial transparency in the delivery of the project could have been improved had better external monitoring taken place over the project period. APFNet as the grantor to the project, has institutional responsibility to assure funded projects meet the Mission, Principles, Values, Objectives and Key Priorities of the organisation, including the Monitoring and Evaluation System. The TE believes that more intensive monitoring of project activities and financial flows would have greatly improved the delivery of the project. Examples can be found in the delivery of reports, as outlined in the inception Annual Work Plan, i.e., Quarterly Progress Reports (RFD 2013). The job of the TE is to ask questions. It became clear when reviewing the documents at the inception of this Terminal Evaluation that queries as to why those documents were outstanding were answered by the lack of periodic monitoring.

During the review, the TE was briefed by the APFNet delegation that the project did not have interim third-party monitoring. This partially explains the queries by the TE. The inability to implement regularly scheduled external documentation, progress and/or financial audits has contributed to the challenges faced during the implementation of this project. This is because strict monitoring of compliance to the agreed timetables would place a 'safeguard' into the programme and/or even flows of finance, which could be used by APFNet to ensure compliance to agreed programmes of work and/or modalities. A mandatory monitoring and compliance programme, either internally or externally, can greatly assist the effectiveness of project implementation, such as assuring project deliverables and reports are substantive and delivered on-time. Such measures could also be part of a larger internal quality assurance programme through the application of ISO quality management systems within the APFNet organisation itself. The monitoring on documentation, finance and the progress of project implementation can be further strengthened.

References

- APFNet. 2018. Guidelines for APFNet Project Monitoring and Evaluation. Asia-Pacific Partnership Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation, Beijing, China.
- APFNet. 2013. APFNet Manual for Project Identification, Implementation and Management (PIIM). Asia-Pacific Partnership Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation, Beijing, China.
- RFD. 2019. Project Final Report 2019. APRnet Fund Project on Strengthening Urban Forestry Demonstration Site of Bang Kachao (Thailand) for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Learning Center [2012P1/2-THA]. International Forestry Cooperation Office, Royal Forestry Department, Bangkok, Thailand.
- RFD. 2018 Project Annual Work Plan February to December 2018. Strengthening Urban Forestry Demonstration Site of Bang Kachao (Thailand) for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Learning Center [2012P1/2-THA]. International Forestry Cooperation Office, Royal Forestry Department, Bangkok, Thailand.
- RFD. 2017. Project Annual Work Plan June 2016 to May 2017. Strengthening Urban Forestry Demonstration Site of Bang Kachao (Thailand) for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Learning Center [2012P1/2-THA]. International Forestry Cooperation Office, Royal Forestry Department, Bangkok, Thailand.
- RFD. 2016. Project Progress Report 2016. Project Progress Report: Strengthening Urban Forestry Demonstration Site of Bang Kachao (Thailand) for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Learning Center [03/October/2014 to 02/October/2015]. International Forestry Cooperation Office, Royal Forestry Department, Bangkok, Thailand.
- RFD. 2013. Annual Work Plan 2013. Strengthening Urban Forestry Demonstration Site of Bang Kachao (Thailand) for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Learning Center. International Forestry Cooperation Office, Royal Forestry Department, Bangkok, Thailand.
- RFD. 2012. Project Proposal 2012. Project Proposal: Strengthening Urban Forestry Demonstration Site of Bang Kachao (Thailand) for Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Learning Center. Project No.: APFNet/2012/THA/01. International Forestry Cooperation Office, Royal Forestry Department, Bangkok, Thailand.

Annex I: Evaluation agenda

Table 3: Evaluation agenda.

| Date and Time | Activity |
|-----------------|--|
| 02 April | |
| 09.30-11:00 | Pre-meeting between Climate Forestry and APFNet |
| 13:00 | Welcome the Evaluation Team by RFD |
| 13.15 | Overall introduction of the project <i>by Mr. Preecha Ongprasert (Project Coordinator)</i> |
| 13.30 - 15.30 | Report: Output 1 Activity 1.1. Establishing an exhibition and interpretative centre Activity 1.2. Maintaining the character and value of the project site to help develop ecotourism, <i>Mr. Aoot Chaothwee, Head of Rayong Forest Nursery Centre: The Consultant</i> Activity 1.3. Implementing a natural conservation and urban forestry program as part of the curriculum of local schoolchildren Activity 1.4. Encouraging local volunteers and youth groups to become involved in education programs Activity 1.5 Implement a natural conservation and urban forestry programme as curriculum for local school children <i>By Ms. Pariyaporn Sukul, Project Manager</i> |
| | Report: Output 2 Activity 2.1. Developing facilities of the project site to provide visitors with a more extensive experience to visitors Activity 2.2. Marketing the Bang Kachao site to potential visitors Activity 2.3. Training local people as tour guides <i>By Dr. Aroonsri Auesriwong, Eco-tourism Specialist Rajabhat Udonthani University: The Consultant</i> |
| | Report: Output 3 Activity 3.1 Developing conservation sites to support endemic fauna Activity 3.2 Maximising the biodiversity of the project site through scientific management, <i>By Ms. Panali Mungkornsakshithi, Forest Officer Forest Resource Management Centre 10 (Rachaburi): The Consultant</i> |
| | Report: Output 4 Activity 4.1 Documenting the project information Activity 4.2 Reporting <i>By Ms. Pariyaporn Sukul, Project Manager</i> |
| 03 April | |
| 09.30-12:00 | Site visit and interview with project key stakeholders Visit Suan Pa Ket Nom Klao Urban Community Forest, and evaluate on-sites activities of Output 1-3, (Interview the head of the UCF) |
| 12.00-13:00 | Lunch at Suan Pa Ket Nom Klao Urban Community Forest |
| 13.30-14:00 | Visit Nakhon Khuan Khan Green Area and eco-Management Centre of RFD (meet the Head of the Centre) |
| 14.00-14:45 | Visit 80 th King Birthday Memorial Park under the CSR Programme of Petroleum Authority of Thailand (PTT). |
| 14.45 -15:30 | Visit Lamphoo Bang Krasorb Nature Conservation Group-Network of Conservation Group in Bang Kachao |

Annex II: Project progress table

Table 4: Project progress table. Indicators are repeated from Table X for ease of reference. *Ratings used are the same as those outlined in [Annex III](#) below.

| Project Output | Indicators | Baseline of activities | Progress made | Rating* | Comments |
|----------------|--|------------------------|--|---------|--|
| Output 1.1 | Physical site office, demonstration centre, learning signboards, meeting rooms | - | Physical learning centre established with signboards and logos | 2 | Many signboards were said to have been made but no logos were found to be printed on them |
| Output 1.2 | Appropriate areas of interest for exhibition and activities | - | Learning centre is a permanent instillation and satisfactory | 3 | None |
| Output 1.3 | Meetings with stakeholders and the development of curriculum | - | All stakeholders were knowledgeable and were clearly briefed on the project and the objectives | 4 | Stakeholders very enthusiastic about the outputs of this project |
| Output 1.4 | Completion of training programmes | - | Participation from local volunteers and youth groups was clearly evident during the assessment | 4 | Stakeholders very enthusiastic about the outputs of this project |
| Output 2.1 | Consultative meetings between ecotourism expert team and communities | - | Evidence of meetings between ecotourism expert team and communities found during the assessment | 4 | Stakeholders very enthusiastic about the outputs of this project |
| Output 2.2 | Conduct market research and develop marketing plans and strategies | - | No evidence was presented to demonstrate the results of the secondary data investigation of behaviour of tourists and visitors to Bang Kachao and marketing plan | 1 | Evidence is required to demonstrate the results of the secondary data investigation of behaviour |

| | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Output 2.3 | Meeting minutes of training seminars | - | Evidence was presented indicating training seminars were conducted. | 4 | Stakeholders very enthusiastic about the outputs of this project |
| Output 3.1 | Collection of baseline information for site selection and meetings to decide on final locations | - | Incomplete | 1 | RFD was unable to display evidence to the assessor this Output was completed. |
| Output 3.2 | Implement ecological surveys and make decisions based on management and stakeholder consultations | - | Partially completed | 2 | RFD should provide records of all work undertaken to the assessor to demonstrate transparency. |
| Output 4.1 | Creation of an information log and database | - | Partially completed. | 2 | RFD should provide records of all work undertaken to the assessor to demonstrate transparency. |
| Output 4.2 | Publications and promotional material | - | Incomplete | 1 | Issues related to inconsistency and transparency evident across the reports and evidence provided |

Annex III: Project overall rating table

To support more systematic recording of evaluation findings, APFNet evaluation will use a rating table with score to record project performance and the table should be attached to the evaluation report. The scoring criterion is as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Highly satisfactory/4: | The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a <i>very good</i> extent. |
| Satisfactory /3: | The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a <i>good</i> extent. |
| Moderate /2: | The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a <i>fair</i> extent. |
| Unsatisfactory /1: | The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a <i>poor</i> extent. |
| Highly unsatisfactory/ 0: | The criterion was <i>not assessed</i> . |
| D/I: | The criterion was considered but <i>data were insufficient</i> to assign a rating or score. |

The external evaluator(s) also are to provide a brief justification for the rating with score assigned. Identify most notable strengths to build upon as well as highest priority issues or obstacles to overcome. (Note that this table should not be a comprehensive summary of findings and recommendations, but an overview only. A more comprehensive presentation should be captured in the evaluation report.)

Table 5: Project overall rating table.

| Criterion | Description of strong performance | Description of poor performance | Rating by Evaluator | Brief justification by Evaluator |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|
| Relevance of project design | Design was good with key objectives established | Changing objectives due to implementation delays. | 2 | Project design well thought out but improvement on implementation required for successful project execution. |
| Efficiency | Stakeholders and communities working demonstrated excellent aptitude for implementation. | Poor management, reporting and coordination. | 2 | Improvement on implementation required for better efficiency and project execution. |
| Effectiveness | Stakeholders and communities working in the project demonstrated excellent aptitude for implementation. | Poor management, reporting and coordination. | 3 | Despite management challenges, project execution by community stakeholders demonstrates effective capacity for successful project implementation in Thailand. |
| Impacts | The education centre is excellent and offers excellent local information and know-how to visitors | Despite numerous visitors, the impact of the project is limited to immediate area. No efforts to link with outside educational institutions identified. | 3 | Demonstrable impacts to visitors and local school children. |
| Sustainability and duplication | High potential to duplicate the project in Thailand and Southeast Asia. | Despite numerous visitors, the impact of the project is limited to immediate area. No efforts to link with outside educational institutions identified. | 3 | There is a large potential to duplicate the project across Thailand in further in Southeast Asia. |
| Overall score | Good project scope and applicability for learning and duplication. | Project requires sharper management for increase participation of tourists and duplication. | 3 | Despite the management and transparency challenges identified, this project was very well received by the community and the impacts of the demonstration centre will be beneficial to all. |

Annex IV: Questionnaires for data collection

Not used in this terminal evaluation.

Annex V: List of interviewees

Table 6: List of people and organisations interviewed during the Terminal Evaluation.

| Name | Affiliation/Organisation |
|--------------------------|---|
| Aroomsri Auestiwong | Eco-tourism specialist: Suan Pa Ket Nom Klao Urban Community Forest |
| Aoot Chaothwee | Head of Rayong Forest Nursery Centre: The Consultant |
| Kanda Sakullim | Bang Kachao Community Forest Centre |
| Li Zhaochen | APFNet Officer |
| Panali Mungkornsakshithi | Forest Officer, Forest Resource Management Centre 10 (Rachaburi) |
| Pariyaporn Sukul | Project Manager |
| Preecha Ongprasert | Royal Forestry Department |
| Prempreet Trirat | Chair: Suan Pa Ket Nom Klao Urban Community Forest |
| Rattana Plangcharoensri | Bang Kachao Community Forest Centre |
| Zhuo Yufang | APFNet Officer |

