

Reducing Climate Vulnerability of Coastal Communities of Myanmar through an Ecosystem-based Approach

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

9131

Countries

Myanmar

Project Name

Reducing Climate Vulnerability of Coastal Communities of Myanmar through an Ecosystem-based Approach

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/6/2019

Review completed by PM

12/6/2020

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐
CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YS, 3.11.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS, 1.24.2020:

Please refer to comment on Item 5.

YS&FI 11.20.2019:

No. Please refer to comment on item 5 (co-financing) of this review.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

Please see response at 5.

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YS, 3.11.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS, 1.24.2020:

Explanation to the earlier comments are sufficiently provided; however, it is unclear where this has been reflected in the project document(s).
Recommended action: Please address the above point.

YS&FI 11.20.2019:

1) Marginalized/minority groups

We note that Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been submitted. SEP sufficiently delineates on how their needs will be met by the project, as was requested in the PIF review.

2) Gender

We note that Gender Action Plan (GAP) has been submitted. GAP sufficiently delineates on how gender-equality related goals will be met by the project, as requested in the PIF review.

3) Upscaling /replication strategy

Upscaling /replication strategy was requested at PIF stage to further provide information on project activities in other vulnerable parts of the country; however, it is not clear where this has been addressed in the Project Document.

4) Synergy with GEF 6 GEF TF Programming in the country

This was also requested at the PIF stage; however, it is not clear where this has been addressed in the Project Document.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 20 Feb 2020:

Please see the response at number 11.

Potential for scale-up and replication is now described in new Annex 20.

Synergies with GEF6 TF programming in the country is updated in Annex 12.

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

Please see points 3) and 4) addressed in full at number 11.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12.04.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

11.17.2020:

While 'technical support' has been added to the TOR, there are still unclarities on how the role of PM is 'directly' related to the 'outputs/deliverables' under each Component.

The TOR is still mainly about coordination activities, and support /assistance related role which could have some linkages with 'outputs/deliverables' seem to be minimal and limited, which is making justification to charge 40% of PM cost under Components difficult. Please present TOR that further and clearly reflects the contribution, that has a direct linkage with 'outputs/deliverables', of the Project Manager to the three components that his/her position is charged to.

5.14.2020:

Project Manager costs are being charged to different components and only 5% to PMC (i.e., GG), while in Annex 7 ? TOR of Key project staff, the PM position seems to be mainly management tasks and without any specific deliverables to project components. Please fully charge Project Manager costs to the PMC or to provide the appropriate TORs that would reflect the contribution of this position to the components to which hers/his costs are charged.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS, 1.24.2020:

Not yet. Please refer to comment on Item 5.

YS&FI 11.20.2019: Further elaboration requested. While co-financing has decreased its volume as well as changed its composition, project components/activities remains largely unchanged. Project components/activities need to reflect these changes in co-financing and/or provide clear and sufficient justification. Please discuss why the change in co-financing has not affected the project components.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 23 Nov 2020:

Addition outputs/deliverables by each technical component of the project have been added to the TOR for Project Manager (please see Annex 6 and 7 uploaded to the Roadmap section).

UNDP, 9 Oct 2020:

The budget for Project Manager has been adjusted so that 60% of the costs are budgeted under PMC. The Project Manager, while providing day-to-day management of the project, will also provide technical support to other technical specialists, review technical documents and provide inputs in technical activity implementation and knowledge management products. The TOR for Project Manager has been revised to reflect the above (please see Annex 7).

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

Please see comment at 5, as new inclusions to co-financing amounts mean that co-financing amounts match the PIF submission amounts. Please see the additional changes in the ProDoc for reflected project components.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YS, 1.24.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed. Project document(s) are also updated accordingly.

YS&FI 11.20.2019: Risk matrix with countermeasures are elaborated in Section A.5; however, further elaboration is required re the identified risk of ?Rohingya/Rakhine Muslim communities losing fishing rights along the coast?.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

The risk of local communities (including Rakhine Muslim communities) losing fishing rights is considered sufficiently low at this stage because of the deliberate choice of the use of the community forestry approach in this project, and the community engagement process being undertaken for each site which allows all risks to be evaluated and dealt with in a locally specific and appropriate way. For this reason, this risk was not originally included in the risk matrix. However, this risk is now acknowledged and elaborated in the risk matrix and mitigation strategy in Section A.5.

The potential risk of the fishing right restriction was first acknowledged during the concept note stage as a result of scanning of a range of all conceivable risks in the wider context of the project. This was due to mixed or contradictory interpretations and practical applications of the Forest Law being applied ?on the ground?. However, the updated 2018 version of the Forest Law, amended the offences section so there is no longer an offence for ?fishing in a reserve forest.?

Prior to the changes made to the law in 2018, the law stipulated that a permit was required for catching animals, hunting or fishing in a forest area. However, this stipulated also that 'if it is for domestic or agricultural or piscatorial use not on a commercial scale, forest produce may be extracted in an amount not exceeding the stipulated quantity, without obtaining a permit'. Based on this clause, Muslim community members who were predominantly practicing artisanal fishing should not have been restricted in their fishing activities. Despite this, there were cases where local community members and/or local forest officials erroneously believed that fishing in reserve forests were prohibited. It is based on these accounts that the risk was initially acknowledged during the PIF stage.

All mangrove areas that are targeted in this LDCF project will be conserved, rehabilitated or regenerated through the Community Forestry approach, which aims to promote conservation of natural resources while ensuring equitable access to such resources in a sustainable manner, based on a community agreement. Community forest user groups are established as communal stewards of mangrove forests, and the project will build their capacity to have a community agreement, in an inclusive and conflict sensitive manner, on the extent and conditions of permissible natural resource extraction by members. The project will continue to monitor the inclusivity and any signs of adverse impacts on a particular group including Rakhine Muslims. Should there be a risk of access rights restriction, including access to coastal fishery resources by certain groups, as a result of the project activity (for example because they are not allowed to be part of a community forest user group), an assessment will be undertaken as per UNDP's Social and Environmental Safeguard Policy and an Indigenous People's Plan will be triggered.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YS, 3.11.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS, 1.24.2020:

Evidence is provided and the volume of the co-finance has been addressed to match the level indicated in the PIF. However, change in the type of co-financing has not been addressed.

Recommended action: Please address the above point.

YS&FI 11.20.2019: Further information is requested. Evidence is not provided for that from 'Environmental Conservation Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation' (\$1.2 million). Also, total co-financing volume has significantly decreased (by about 20%) including \$13 million in grant, from the PIF.

Recommended action: Please provide an evidence for: 1) 'Environmental Conservation Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation' (\$1.2 million) co-finance; and, 2) justification for significant decrease in the total volume, including that of the in kind contribution.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 20 Feb 2020:

Additional explanations of the change in the type and composition of co-financing are provided in the CEO ER, Section II, 4) Co-financing.

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

See additional co-financing letters received after the first submission from the Ministry of Transport and Communications, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology (USD6.5 million), and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation, Environmental Conservation Department (USD1.2 million). The additional amounts confirmed by the Department of Meteorology and Hydrology (DMH) of USD6.5 million (rather than the initially anticipated USD1.8 million), place co-financing at the amount of USD21.8 million, which matches the co-financing amounts in the PIF.

Please see new changes included in the ProDoc that reflect the additional co-financing amounts received. (See pages 2, 13-19, 35-37 and 43).

Co-finance letters are annexed to the ProDoc - in a separate folder of Annexes uploaded to Roadmap

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YS&FI, 4.29.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS&FI, 3.11.2020:

Not yet. There are still figures under Indicator 11 of the Core Indicators table in the online PIF template. Please delete these, since this table is for GEFTF projects.

YS, 1.24.2020:

Core Indicators and Meta-Information for CCA are appropriately provided. However, please delete figures entered for Indicator 11 in the Core Indicators table in the online PIF template, since it is for GEFTF projects. Also, please provide an explanation for reduced target for Core Indicator 3.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS&FI 11.20.2019: No. Tracking tool (Indicators) submitted as Annex 14 is not sufficient. Since this is the CEO Endorsement stage, Agency is required to submit (i) CCA Core Indicators (ii) additional relevant Indicators and (iii) Meta-Information.
"https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-climate-change-adaptation-results-framework-gef-7"

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP- 24 Mar 2020: the figures under Indicator 11 were removed.

UNDP, 20 Feb 2020:

Indicator 11 has been deleted.

Regarding Core Indicator 3, ??? that appears in the CCA Result Framework ? Tracking Tool is an error. This should have been ?3?: They are Rakhine State Coastal Adaptation Plan; Thandwe District Forestry Plan; and local DRM plans. (DRM plans are expected to be developed for each village tract; however, these DRM plans are counted as one collectively as it is the consistent application of a mainstreaming framework that is important)

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

See attached.

Please note that the total number of direct beneficiaries in the tracking tool is a sum of Row 22, 38, 53 and 90. In this project, the same 24,000 people benefit through Output 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3. To acknowledge that the project generates benefits in these three areas, the number of direct beneficiaries is reported in each of these three sections, resulting in Cell 9-11 triple-counting the number of beneficiaries.

If this is problematic, we will put 0's for Output 1.1.2 and 1.1.3.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10.30.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

5.14.2020:

1. This project is will be executed by UNDP as shown in section A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. However, in Project Information the Executing Partner is different (i.e., Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation Rakhine State Government). Please provide clarification and/or update.
2. If this project is to be executed by UNDP, an explicit request signed by the GEF OFP(s) of the participant country(ies) indicating the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including any execution activities provided by a GEF Agency, is required. The request should provide a sound justification for the execution activities that the GEF Agency may perform.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS, 1.24.2020:

Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed; however, it is unclear where this has been reflected in the project document(s).

Recommended action: Please address the above point.

YS 11.20.2019: Further elaboration requested. While institutional arrangement for the project implementation is clearly delineated, further clarification and elaboration is requested on how related initiatives and national/regional plans are coordinated (e.g., regular meetings, fora etc.).

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 9 Oct 2020:

1. Please see below.

Whereas it was earlier agreed that the project will be implemented under Direct Implementation Modality, based on follow on consultations and aligned with GEF guidance on separation of Implementation Agency and Executing roles, a subsequent meeting with GEF-OFP and project stakeholders discussed the implementation

modality issues further and agreed that the project will be implemented under National Implementation Modality. **The Environmental Conservation Department (ECD), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation (MoNREC) will serve as the Execution Entity (Implementation Partner in UNDP terminology) for the project.** The changes have been captured in the ProDoc. The meeting minutes have also been included as Annex 18.

UNDP, 20 Feb 2020:

Section 7, Consistency with National Priorities, of the CEO ER as well as Annex 12, Partnerships, to the Project Document have been updated.

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

Alignment with national/regional/state plans and strategies and coordination with related initiatives are ensured through multiple mechanisms. Firstly, to align the project objective and activities with national/regional/state plans and strategies, the proposed project will receive necessary guidance primarily from the Project Board. The Project Board incorporates all key concerned stakeholders including relevant ministries from the Union level as well as representatives from the State Government. A Technical Advisory and Coordination Committee will be established at the State level (see the project governance and management structure in Page 32 of the Project Document) to ensure that the project activities are coordinated with relevant initiatives and guided by State level strategies. There is also multi-stakeholder coordination platform(s) that are supported under Project Outcome 1.

Furthermore, the proposed project will use the coordination mechanisms established in the UNDP-supported Governance for Resilience and Sustainability Project (GRSP) and the Rakhine Area Based Project (RAAP). The RABP provides coordination through its institutional support delivered to both State and township level authorities for project operation. The GRSP coordinates at national levels multiple agencies in support of the implementation of the National Environmental Policy, interlinked with Myanmar's Climate Change Strategy and Master Plan, and the Myanmar Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (MAPDRR) as well as in advocacy for climate change adaptation and resilience, DRR and environmental inter-sectoral mainstreaming. Through these linkages, GRSP and the project will work collaboratively on the policy development and implementation components of the project both at the Union and State level.

The project ensures coordination with related initiatives for greater impacts on the ground through collaboration with several partners on complimentary project activities. For mangrove restoration and conservation activities under Outcome two, the project

will work closely with DANIDA and MSN which have been operating in other townships of Rakhine. DANIDA, is using the Community Forestry approach to protect existing mangrove forests in Yambye and Myebon townships. Adjustments in the target townships in this LDCF project were partially through the detailed consultations with the DANIDA advisor based in the Forest Department during the PPG phase to avoid duplication. Exchange of experiences will continue during the project implementation. MSN has a track record in converting abandoned or unproductive fish/shrimp ponds or paddy fields into healthy mangrove forests in Rakhine, and the PIF and the Project Document have been prepared with extensive consultations with them. It is expected that they will provide assistance during the project implementation as well. For Outcome 3, the proposed LDCF project will work closely with Malteser International to learn from the CBDRM approach they have been implementing in Rakhine over years. Conversely, the results from the multi-hazard risk assessment and various knowledge/information products from it will be shared with Malteser so that they can use them to improve the accessibility of hazard information to the populations of Rakhine.

As co-financiers of this project, DANIDA, MSN and Malteser are all expected to be represented either at the Project Board or the State-level Technical Advisory and Coordination Committee, which ensures that meetings take place on a regular basis.

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10.30.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

5.14.2020:

'Audit' is included in the M&E budget (total \$15k); this needs to be charged to PMC.

YS&FI 11.20.2019:

GEF 7 CCA Results Framework is required. Please refer to comment on Item 6.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 9 Oct 2020:

The 'Audit' cost has been removed from the M&E budget table. It is charged to PMC (please see budget note KK).

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

The document has been updated; this is annex 14 which has been reuploaded to Roadmap.

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request YS 11.20.2019: Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YS, 3.11.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS, 1.24.2020:

Explanation to the earlier comments are sufficiently provided; however, it is unclear where this has been reflected in the project document(s).

Recommended action: Please address the above point.

YS&FI 11.20.2019: Following two comments provided at the PIF stage have not been addressed:

- (i) Please provide further information on potential for scale-up and/or replication of project activities in other vulnerable parts of the country; and,
- (ii) Please discuss synergy with GEF6 GEF TF programming in the country.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 20 Feb 2020:

Potential for scale-up and replication is now described in new Annex 20.

Synergies with GEF6 TF programming in the country is updated in Annex 12.

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

(i) Potential for scale-up and/or replication of project activities

The project provides several areas for potential scale-up and/or replication of project activities to other vulnerable parts of the country.

Firstly, several tools and methodologies will be developed in the project with a clear intention for replication. They include:

- ? The State level Multi-hazard Vulnerability Assessment, produced under Output 1.1, will include activities that ensure that methodologies will be applied in other coastal settings beyond the project boundary. In particular, parameters and requirements for multi-hazard vulnerability assessments will be agreed in multi-stakeholder dialogues involving national and state governments, CSOs/NGOs and academia, and it is expected that the assessment carried out in Rakhine in this project will set standards.
- ? The development of the Rakhine State Coastal Adaptation Plan, based on the Multi-hazard Vulnerability Assessment, is another policy instrument that can be upscaled to the national level or replicated to other States or areas. Risk-informed development is only recently emerging in Myanmar and the scientifically-robust experience from Rakhine would offer critical insights for replication especially in similar coastal settings. Lessons and experiences will be widely shared through the Project Board structure.
- ? The Strategic Environmental Assessment, carried out under Activity 1.3, is another tool that will be pilot tested with an intension for replication across the country. It helps multiple stakeholders with various stakes to recognize multiple uses of natural resources and to make informed decision over the management of such resources. To maximize the replication potential of the SEA, guidance will be made available and associated capacity building will be undertaken.
- ? The Livelihood Forums to be established at the Village Tract level are an approach which facilitates participation of community members of various backgrounds in an assessment of livelihood needs and selection of beneficiaries (with focus on women and other vulnerable groups), and planning of project activities. This approach, first tested in the Rakhine-Area Based Programme (RABP), has been used as a way to facilitate multi-stakeholder dialogues and prioritize community led interventions in a conflict-sensitive manner. This approach, while it is used in a livelihood-related decision making process in these instances, can be replicated in various other settings including more general community-level decision making processes.

- ? Replicability and upscaling is also being supported under the knowledge management mechanism in place under 3.2 for documentation, sharing of lessons and best practices on mangrove afforestation and management, community based adaptation practices.
- ? Lessons and good practices from the project can also be disseminated via the Project Board for uptake at State and/or national and ministerial levels.

ii) Synergies with GEF6 GEF TF programming in the country

The following two GEF6 TF projects, currently under implementation, have been consulted during the design of the proposed LDCF project:

- ? My Coast project, supported by FAO, compliments the LDCF project's activities under Output 1 and 2. My Coast project promotes coastal conservation and management including conservation and rehabilitation of mangroves. My Coast is expected to take place in Thanintharyi, and successes and failures of community-based mangrove restoration and management will be exchanged. Moreover, the experience of multi-hazard risk assessment process and the formulation of the Rakhine State Coastal Adaptation Plan will be complementary to the ICZM objective of the My Coast project. During the design of the LDCF project, UNDP and the project formulation team consulted the My Coast project implementation team and continued exchange of information was agreed on a need basis.
- ? The GEF 6 Ridge to Reef, supported by UNDP, also provide multiple complementarities. Most notably, sustainable management of coastal (mangrove) ecosystems is a common element in both projects and lessons will be shared between the two projects. The investment that the Ridge to Reef project is making in enhanced knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation is also relevant for the knowledge generation, codification and management activities that are integrated throughout the LDCF-financed activities. [Note that the Ridge to Reef project is currently undergoing a review by the UNDP Social and Environmental Compliance Unit and the results of the review may warrant restructuring of the scope of the project. The complementarities shown above is based on the original project design].

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

YS, 1.24.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed. Project document(s) are also updated accordingly.

YS&FI 11.20.2019: Further elaboration requested. It was not clear from the project document how the identified risk of 'Rohingya/Rakhine Muslim communities losing fishing rights along the coast' was explored and reflected in the proposal.

Recommended action: Please address the above.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

Please see explanation at 4.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2.4.2021

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template.

11.17.2020:

Not yet. Agency is requested to address comment(s) for item(s): 3.

YS&FI, 5.14.2020:

Not yet. Agency is requested to address comment(s) for item(s): 3, 8 and 9.

YS&FI, 3.11.2020:

Not yet. Agency is requested to address comment(s) for item(s): 6

YS, 1.24.2020:

Not yet. Agency is requested to address comments for items: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 11.

YS&FI 11.20.2019:

Not yet. Agency is requested to address comments for items: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP, 23 Nov 2020:

Noted, the comment has been addressed.

UNDP, 9 Oct 2020:

Noted; the comments above have been addressed.

UNDP, 24 Mar 2020:

The comment has been addressed.

UNDP, 20 Feb 2020:

Noted; the comments have been addressed.

UNDP, 10 Jan 2020:

Noted; the comments have been addressed.

Review Dates

**Secretariat comment at CEO
Endorsement Request**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	11/20/2019	1/10/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/24/2020	2/25/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/11/2020	10/12/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2020	11/23/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/14/2020	