

# Strengthening Myanmar's institutional and technical capacities to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10380

**Countries**

Myanmar

**Project Name**

Strengthening Myanmar's institutional and technical capacities to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

10/11/2019

**Review completed by PM**

6/9/2020

**Program Manager**

Satoshi Yoshida

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes. Myanmar ratified the Paris Agreement. This project is aligned with CCM 3-8 under the GEF-7 Programming Directions.

## **Agency Response**

### **Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, May 5, 2020: Cleared.

AT, 10/29/19: Not sufficiently.

Please revise the component structure in Table B so that readers could easily understand, monitor and evaluate project activities from the Table. For example, it is suggested to revise the Project Objective, Components, Outcomes and Outputs as follows;

In addition, please revise the relevant descriptions in the CEO Approval Request including the chapter "1a. 3) the proposed alternative scenario" accordingly.

[Project Objective] To strengthen Myanmar's institutional (and technical) capacity to meet the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) of the Paris Agreement

Component 1: Strengthening institutional and human capacities for preparing GHG inventories on a regular basis in accordance with Paris Agreement requirements;

Outcome 1: Institutional and human capacities for preparing GHG inventories strengthened;

Output 1.1: Formal institutional arrangements including procedural and legal framework established;

Output 1.2: IT based National GHG Inventory System for preparing and reporting GHG Inventory and archiving data developed and made available to line ministries and agencies;

Output 1.3: Tools and protocols developed and adopted for GHG data collection and GHG Inventory preparation and training provided to stakeholders;

Output 1.4: Country-specific emission factors for energy sector and agriculture and livestock sector developed;

Component 2: Strengthening institutional and human capacities to track and report transparently implementation of its National Determined Contributions and support received;

Outcome 2: Institutional and human capacity for tracking and reporting of its Nationally Determined Contributions and support received strengthened;

Output 2.1: Domestic MRV system for tracking NDC actions designed and operationalized;

Output 2.2: Monitoring indicators and tools to track progress towards the energy goals designed and made available;

Output 2.3: Framework for tracking support received for implementing NDC designed and recommendations for implementation developed;

Component 3: Strengthening regional cooperation for knowledge and information sharing including cooperative research projects for developing emission factors;

Outcome 3: Regional cooperation for knowledge and information sharing strengthened;

Output 3: (for example) Organize a workshop, country-specific training and peer exchange programs, etc.

**Agency Response** 4/30/2020 The suggested re-structuring of Outcomes, Outputs and activities has been implemented.

**Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Co-financing is not obligatory for a CBIT project.

**Agency Response**

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, May 5, 2020: Cleared.

AT, 10/29/19: The proposed total GEF financing (\$1,418,450) is reasonable amount. However, please enter "CBIT set-aside" in "Programming of Funds" in Table D.

**Agency Response**

4/30/2020 Table D updated.

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: This project requests resources from the CBIT set-aside in Climate Change focal Area.

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: This project requests resources from the CBIT set-aside in Climate Change focal Area.

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, May 5, 2020: Cleared.

AT, 10/29/19: Yes. The proposed PPG amount (\$40,000) is reasonable amount. However, please enter "CBIT set-aside" in "Programming of Funds" in Table E.

**Agency Response** 4/30/2020 Table E updated.  
**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

**Agency Response**  
**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, June 8, 2020: Thank you for the clarification on adaptation. Cleared.

SY, May 5, 2020: Please reconsider the rio maker, taking into account the relevance of adaptation to to this CBIT project.

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

**Agency Response**

May 28,2020

The activity has a Rio Marker “2” for Mitigation because it supports the country to meet its obligations under the Convention. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Annex%2018.%20Rio%20markers.pdf>

The project will not cover M&E for adaptation actions. hence the Marker will be “0” for Adaptation.

Outcome 2 (p.19) The output will not focus on adaptation action tracking as the country is developing a NAP proposal for submission to GCF, which will cover the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of vulnerability and adaptation. Future work on tracking adaptations actions will be undertaken based on M&E work under the NAP proposal.

Output 2.3 (p.20) “This sub-output will complement existing national systems and protocols to measure and track the financial flows and identify the institutional arrangements for the existing donor procedures/guidelines for tracking, reporting and verifying the support received, with a focus on climate change mitigation and having placeholders for adaptation.”

Output 3. 6 (p.32) “The CBIT project further builds on Myanmar’s NAPA, submitted in 2012, which focuses on the sectors agriculture, forestry, water and health and identifies 32 priority activities (referred to as Priority Adaptation Projects) for effective climate change adaptation for eight main sectors/themes. In the NAPA, the lack of data, systematic monitoring and coordination among sectors is pointed out, as well as the need for strengthened institutions. The CBIT project will include placeholders for the national MRV system so that information and data collected under the NAPA feeds into the climate reporting being undertaken by the country.”

**Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**



### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

Myanmar, as one of the LDCs, faces the toughest challenges against the impacts of climate change. There is a gap in knowledge and understanding of the science and impacts of climate change, specifically on how these macro-changes affected the country.

The first National Communication (1NC) was submitted to the UNFCCC in 2012 and the second NC is under preparation.

There are gaps to enhance the transparency framework in the country such as gaps on technical capacity for preparing the GHG inventory, various institutional capacity in the government, information sharing mechanism with stakeholders, etc.

### **Agency Response**

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

Myanmar is preparing for the second National Communication (2NC) and the Initial biennial update report (1BUR) and activities to develop national MRV system. However, these baseline activities are not sufficient to strengthen technical and institutional capacities for the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement.

### **Agency Response**

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, June 8, 2020: Thank you for updates and clarification. Comments cleared.

SY, May 15, 2020: Thank you for updating.

1. Please provide rationale for not including the forestry sector in "Develop sector-specific GHG emission spreadsheets, toolkits and guidelines for all IPCC sectors." Does UN REDD+ project fully cover the forestry sector (these products exist), or the government is ready, to meet the MPG of Article 13 of the PA?
2. Please briefly provide indicative improvements from the current status to the outcomes of this project in terms of coverage of inventory and MRV system (including gases and sectors), the inventory cycle (e.g. frequency in compiling the GHG inventory and the time lag between the reporting year and the year of the inventory (x-2 or x-3)), and improvements of methodologies (from tier 1 to higher tiers, in which sector).
3. While the title of the component 3 includes "cooperative research projects," it is not fully explained in the document. Please clarify or modify the title.

AT, 10/29/19: Not sufficiently. As requested in Part 1/Box2, please revise the structure of the Project Objective / Components/ Outcomes/ Outputs appropriately.

## Agency Response

May 28, 2020

1. Myanmar has included three carbon pools (above ground biomass, below ground biomass and litter) for their initial FREL development. In the national FREL submitted in 2019, a combination of Tier 1 and 2 approaches were used in estimating these carbon pools using the following information from the management inventory of 40 districts:

- ID of Tree/Stand and its Location (District ID, Latitude and Longitude)
- Tree Type/Categories (by two categories, i.e. stand DBH of 20 cm and above, and that of 10 cm to 19 cm)
- Forest Types (by 19 Types that were mentioned in Section 2.3)
- Tree Species Code (based on Forest Inventory Manual of Forest Department)
- Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) in cm

Further, the UN-REDD+ program has planned inventory improvement activities. Based on this analysis, forestry sector-specific MRV needs were excluded from the current project, but are taken into account in the overarching institutional and data management framework design to ensure that the Forestry sector can be nested within a single national MRV system

2. The Outcome description under the Alternative Section has been updated to include improvements in terms of coverage and frequency. Additional gases to be covered beyond the 3 required and currently reported will be assessed during the project implementation phase, as there is no process for collecting or estimating data for the additional gases. Further descriptions of outputs 1.2 and 1.3 have been updated to reflect the changes.

3. Output 3.1, as described in the proposed activities, is aimed at developing common regional emission factors where applicable. This has been clarified and now the description includes “Organize cooperative projects to identifying opportunities for developing common regional emissions factors” as one of the proposed activities.

4/30/2020 Project Alternative scenario is updated.

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes. This project is aligned with Objective 3 "foster enabling conditions or mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies" of the Climate Change Programming Directions.

**Agency Response**

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

**Agency Response**

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

**Agency Response**

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, May 5, 2020: Cleared. Please further elaborate in terms of continuous improvements in MRV and institutional capacities as well as meeting requirements of the BTR at the CEOER stage.

AT, 10/29/19: Mostly fine, but from the context of sustainability, please explain in detail how the government will elaborate to prepare transparency reports and strengthen transparency framework after the project ends.

### **Agency Response**

May 28, 2020 –

The requested information is noted and will be addressed at the CEOER stage.

4/30/2020 This has been in addressed in the relevant section of PIF. The additional text is highlighted in yellow.

### **Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, June 19, 2020: Cleared.

SY, June 11, 2020: Stakeholders consulted during the PIF preparation are all checked, while a description about those consultations is not provided. Please provide such a description or adjust checked boxes (with a justification if no consultation was conducted), as per the relevant policies and guidelines.

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

### **Agency Response**

June 12, 2020:

As the section asked for information on “provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.” Information in the section explained how at PPG stage these actors will be engaged. The description as requested has now been added to the document. Further, the indigenous people and local communities box was ticked off, as it was an oversight

### **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, June 8, 2020: Comments cleared.

SY, May 5, 2020: Thank you for updating. Please including indicative information on the collection of gender-disaggregated data and information on gender, in line with the Gender Policy and Guideline, as appropriate.

AT, 10/29/19: Not yet.

Please add brief description on the country gender analysis including context, barriers and plans to address gender issues.

## **Agency Response**

May 28, 2020

The description in Part II, section 3 has been updated following this guidance note: <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF%20Guidance%20on%20Gender.pdf>

4/30/2020 This has been addressed in the relevant section of the PIF. The additional text is highlighted in yellow.

### **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19; Yes.

## **Agency Response**

### **Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, June 8, 2020: ESS information has been also provided.

SY, May 5, 2020: Cleared.

AT, 10/29/19: Not sufficiently. There is a potential risk on the regular update of GHG inventory and failure of establishment of inter- governmental coordination mechanism for the transparency framework. Please consider adding these risks and their mitigation measures.

**Agency Response** 4/30/2020 This has been included in the relevant section. The additional text is highlighted in yellow.

#### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, June 8, 2020: Comments cleared.

SY, May 15, 2020: While Executing Agency is provided, information related to project management including PMU and its functions, coordination with ministries and other institutions, and coordination on M&E are not clear. Please include indicative information as appropriate, which could be further elaborated at the CEOER stage.

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

May 28, 2020

Institutional coordination with other line ministries and institutions will utilize existing coordination mechanisms established by NC/BUR projects. This has been highlighted in the sections on: Coordination and Consistency with National Priorities. Specific barriers to be overcome are also identified in Part.2.1a.

As the executing agency, ECD will define and coordinate responsibilities within its divisions and among development partners through a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) to be chaired by the ECD DG (or delegate). The PIU will hold monthly meetings comprising all key project partners to ensure efficient implementation and monitoring of activities. The primary inter-ministerial coordination mechanism for all activities related to Climate Change is the National Environmental Conservation and Central Climate Change Committee (NECCCC), a committee that is chaired by the Vice President. The project PIU chairperson will provide quarterly updates on its progress to the NECCCC and use this channel to ensure the support and cooperation among all relevant government ministries and departments.

The coordination arrangements with all stakeholders and the role of stakeholders will be further elaborated at the Full Proposal document, including a detailed M&E plan as well as coordination on M&E.

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

AT, 10/29/19: Yes. This project is endorsed by the GEF OFP for Myanmar.

**Mr. Hla Maung THEIN**



Operational Focal Point since 2016-10-04  
Director General, Environmental Conservation Department  
Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry

## **Agency Response**

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

## **Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

SY, June 19, 2020: All comments cleared.

SY, June 11, 2020: Please address the comment on Stakeholder engagement in the above.

SY, May 15, 2020: Please further address the above comments.

AT, 10/29/19: Not at this time. Please address all comments stated above.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1. CBIT projects are usually implemented in conjunction with the government's own activities and in-kind contribution. Please review co-financing portfolio in the preparation phase, as appropriate.
2. Please further elaborate expected improvements of GHG inventory systems including frequency, time gaps, methodologies for each sector and sectoral coverage. Please also elaborate regional emissions factors and their benefits.
3. It is expected that the enhanced transparency framework including improved MRV systems will allow the country to submit BTRs in line with the MPGs of Article 13. Please elaborate the BTR preparation in the CEOER.
4. With gender analysis provided, gender action plan should describe how the plan will incorporate and execute gender actions in relevant components and responsive measures with indicators and targets (including gender-disaggregated).
5. Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up: In terms of innovation, please elaborate MRV systems to be developed utilize technologies/approaches to increase cost-effectiveness and accuracy in data collection, calculation, and verification, and linkage with sector-specific data, which are robust, sustainable, replicable, and user-friendly. Sustainability and relevant risks need to be elaborated, including on continuous enhancement of MRV system after the project cycle and turnover of staff. Please elaborate regional and local level capacity-building in scaling up.
6. Stakeholder engagement should be further elaborated in non-governmental stakeholders and means and timing of engagement. Coordination should be also further defined.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

Myanmar ratified the Paris Agreement (PA) in 2016 and is eligible to access CBIT support. Myanmar submitted to the UNFCCC its Initial National Communication (NC1) in 2012 and currently under preparation of NC2 with gradual improvements. However, there are still many challenges and barriers need to be addressed in order to meet the requirements of the Article 13 of the PA and to enhance its Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) and climate actions.

The project aims that Myanmar will adopt a robust Enhanced Transparency Framework to track and report transparently a National GHG Inventory, NDC implementation and GHG emissions, and climate finance received in line with UNFCCC and the PA commitments. The project requests \$1,597,003 from the CBIT set-aside under the GEF Trust Fund (including PPG: \$40,000 and fees in total: \$138,553). Co-financing is currently not envisaged.

**Barriers to be addressed include:**

1. GHG Inventory and technical capacities: The country lacks adequate capacity to prepare GHG inventories and inadequate experience or capacity to track and report climate change actions, including Environmental Conservation Department's (ECD) of Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment Conservation, which is responsible for transparency reporting. Furthermore, the capacity rests mostly with external agencies. There is no GHG inventory system in the country and any process for preparing a GHG inventory is designed for each report to the UNFCCC. The data for GHG inventory preparation only allows Tier 1 estimation of GHG emissions and several sub-sectoral estimations require significant assumptions.
2. Institutional arrangements: The coordination and involvement of stakeholders are largely project based and there are no institutional structures to drive formal coordination and cooperation among various stakeholders and enable ECD to effectively report on GHG inventories and climate actions to the international community. The line ministries and other institutions that manage activities with emissions have no defined mandate to participate in data collection or estimating GHG emissions. Thus, there are no permanent institutional arrangements. There are no processes defined for GHG inventory preparation, no clear-cut responsibility of line ministries or other departments, including private sector, to regularly collect, report or maintain data and no government directives defining the roles.

**Expected outcomes:**

This CBIT project will be the first project to provide support in designing a national transparency system for domestic and international reporting, overcoming the barriers. This will include the establishment of long-term institutional arrangements, processes and tools to enable Myanmar to meet its reporting obligations under the PA. A key element of the project is building capacity in the core group of ECD and key ministries and agencies to enable ongoing reporting capabilities within the country. The project envisages the below expected outcomes.

1. Institutional and human capacities strengthened for preparing GHG inventories
2. Institutional and human capacity strengthened for tracking and reporting of its Nationally Determined Contributions and support received
3. Regional cooperation for knowledge and information sharing strengthened