

RICE-Adapt: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Farming Communities in the lower Ayeyarwady and Sittaung River Basins

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10395

Countries

Myanmar

Project Name

RICE-Adapt: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Farming Communities in the lower Ayeyarwady and Sittaung River Basins

Agenices

FAO

Date received by PM

10/11/2019

Review completed by PM

11/7/2019

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

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

10/20/2019:

YS: Yes. CCA-1 and CCA-2 in Table A are aligned with 2018-2022 GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF.

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

10/20/2019:

YS: Yes. The components are sufficiently clear for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

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

11/12/2019:

Cleared. 'Sources of co-financing' is appropriately indicated.

11/7/2019:

HS (PPO): ADB should be indicated as 'donor agency' in this case, since co-financier is ADB.

11/1/2019:

HS (PPO): Section C- it is not clear how Investment Mobilized has been identified with this entry. Also, in the "Name of Co-Financier" field, please provide the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated; if the current 'MOALI' was referring to a particular project. For

further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines:(http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes. \$40 million of loans is indicated as a co-finance. Co-finances from MOALI are sufficiently indicated as two of the baseline projects in the PIF.

Agency Response

Thank you and as requested, the following clarification has been provided to the revised PIF:

The investment mobilized are considered, as per GEF definition, not recurrent expenditures. The investment mobilized from the co-financing sources will be new capital investments. The indicative co-finance listed as investment mobilized has been identified through consultations with MOALI and is being considered from the following sources:

- ADB: Resilient Community Development Project (RCDP)
- ADB & GAFSP: Climate-Friendly Agribusiness Value Chain Sector Project

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

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019:

YS: Yes. Myanmar is currently eligible to access up to USD \$10 million from the cumulative \$50 million ceiling.

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

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

10/20/2019:

YS: Yes. PPG requested of \$200k is within the allowable cap (\$200k).

Agency Response

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

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes. Core Indicators and Meta-Information is sufficiently and appropriately provided.

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

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes. The adaptation problem and associated barriers are clearly articulated.

Adaptation problem: the lower parts of the Ayeyarwady and Sittaung river basins are highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change and extreme events; for example, cyclones and strong winds, floods and storm surges, intense rains, and sea level rise. Agricultural production, particularly that of rice, is one of the most important areas of high vulnerability to climate change across the targeted landscapes.

Barriers:

1. Inadequate information to inform and guide decision making on climate change adaptation and disaster risk management
2. Inadequate capacity to mainstream climate change adaptation measures into sectoral planning and implementation at various levels
3. Low capacities to adopt and sustain climate resilient technologies and practices at state and community level
4. Insufficient collaboration and coordination among farmers' organizations, private sectors such as input suppliers, traders and processors

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/1/2019:

Cleared.

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Various baseline projects and initiatives are clearly summarized. However, please consider including 'Enhancing Climate Resilience in the Third Pole' (GCF), which seems to have relevance to this PIF, particularly in terms of risk assessment (Component 1.5).

Recommended action: Please consider including the above project a baseline. If appropriate, please further elaborate it in a coordination.

Agency Response

Duly noted. The 'Third Pole' GCF project's WMO lead has been consulted, and the project is now included for further coordination within the revised PIF (highlighted on page 15). FAO is involved in the Third Pole project as one of its' executing agencies, and this is expected to facilitate further coordination and complementarity between the two initiatives.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/1/2019:

Cleared for PIF stage. Please see CEO Endorsement stage comment.

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Further elaboration requested. 1) please provide further details for justification for component 1.4, particularly on 'climate change education center' (e.g., function, activity, scale, location, which stakeholders will it serve, and how will it be sustained, etc.) 2) please provide further justification on component 1.5 (vulnerability assessments), since activity and geographical location indicated in the PIF seems to overlap with GEFID 5567 project. In particular, please discuss gaps that remains to be addressed.

Recommended actions: Please further elaborate on the above.

Agency Response

Thank you for this and as requested, we have elaborated on the details regarding the two points raised in the above:

1) The exact structure and role of the 'climate change education center' will be further discussed and elaborated with the project partners during PPG. However, it is foreseen that the center will be established based on the integration and strengthening of existing knowledge institutions (universities, research centers, farmer field schools, etc.) and is likely to be managed by the Environmental Conservation Department (ECD). This is reflected in the revised PIF (see page 18).

Based on initial discussions education center is expected to contribute to advocacy and awareness raising on the following areas: 1. Climate change and impacts on agriculture and delta coastal communities; 2. Rice and crop adaptive capacity (AC) to CC; 3. Ways to enhance AC of agriculture based business and the community livelihood; 4. Linking the community with NECCCC and ECCCWC 5. Demonstration sites on crops AC and resilience test and mangrove ecosystem services; 6. Mass media production (hard copy publication, broadcasting on TV channel); 7. Soil and water quality lab or demonstration, 8. Alternative ways to produce or use agriculture residual (rice husks in particular) in place of firewood and technologies such as fuel efficient stove production and distribution; 9. Cyclone adaptable and resilience building technology.

Stakeholders include local coastal and coastal urban community, State/Regional government, farmers, fishermen, MOE (students and teachers from primary to Universities), researchers, media, MONREC (ECD and FD), MOALI (DOA and DOF), MOTC (DMH), UN agencies, NGOs, CSOs, political parties. In terms of the sustainability of the CC education center, a center supervising committee and working committees equipped with a long term plan and sufficient and sustainable finance (both international support and State/Regional and/or National climate budget in accordance with MCCP) will be put in place. Annual progress monitoring and evaluation will be conducted with a team composed of national and international experts.

2) The proposed FAO-LDCF project will potentially build on methodologies and approaches to be developed within the above-mentioned UNEP project. This is now reflected in the updated PIF under Section 1, Part 3 (page 18) and Section 6. However, we have consulted with MONREC and the project has not yet started implementation. There is also no geographical overlap between the two projects as the UNEP project is targeting Chauk Township in dry zone for drought prone area, Myaebon Township in Rakhine for storm prone area, and Hinthada Township in Delta/Ayeyarwday for flood prone area. In addition, the UNEP project is focused on community forestry and livelihood issues generally and not specifically on rice farming communities.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019:

YS: Yes. The proposal is in line with CCA-1 and CCA-2.

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

10/20/2019:

YS: Yes. Sufficient for the PIF stage. At CEO Endorsement stage, the Agency is requested to provide detailed information on LDCF additionality for each of the baseline scenarios and projects.

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

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes. All four Core Indicators with target numbers are sufficiently indicated.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019:

FI: Yes. Sufficient for the PIF stage. By the CEO Endorsement stage, the proponent is requested to provide further detail and elaboration on sustainability plans.

Agency Response

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

10/20/2019:

Yes. The PIF includes geo-reference indicating the project's target area in the lower Ayeyarwady and Sittaung River Basins.

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

11/1/2019:

Cleared for PIF stage. Please see CEO Endorsement stage comment.

10/20/2019:

FI: Please provide further information on how CSOs and community groups will be engaged in the project. Please also discuss whether this project involves ethnic minorities and if so, how they will be affected.

Agency Response

Well noted. Additional information had been provided in the revised PIF, please refer to section 2, page 25.

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

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes. The PIF adequately articulates gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women. Core Indicators also provide gender disaggregated targets.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Yes. The private sector will be highly involved in the proposed project. *Insufficient collaboration and coordination among private sector* is indicated as one of the barriers to be addressed in the project. The project is promoting an ecosystem-based and market-driven approach to build resilience in key ecosystems and to strengthen the adaptive capacities of local private actors and SMEs.

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

11/1/2019:

Cleared for PIF stage. Please see CEO Endorsement stage comment.

10/20/2019:

FI: Please also discuss whether political risks (e.g., change in government; conflict in the project regions) may affect the project and how these can be mitigated.

Agency Response

Thank you for raising this important concern. The risk table has been updated to reflect political risks, please refer to section 5 page 27. The project will follow LIFT's guidance for conflict sensitive programming in Myanmar, which is reflected in the revised PIF (see page 16 and 25).

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

11/1/2019:

Cleared for PIF stage. Please see CEO Endorsement stage comment.

10/20/2019:

YS&FI:

Update requested. Please provide explanation on how the baseline projects/activities are helping in designing this proposal (e.g., how this proposal is building on the baseline projects/activities; how lessons learned and findings from the baseline projects/activities are reflected in the proposal; identification and justification on the remaining gaps to be addressed in this project). As mentioned, please also consider coordination with 'Enhancing Climate Resilience in the Third Pole' (GCF), if appropriate.

Recommended action: Please further elaborate on the above.

Agency Response As requested, further explanation on how the project will build on existing baseline initiatives has been provided, including in terms of GCF coordination. Please refer to the revised PIF, section 6 (highlighted on page 28).

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

10/20/2019:

Yes. The PIF clearly delineates alignments with various National Strategies etc., including NAPA, NDC and ongoing TNA.

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

11/1/2019:

Cleared for PIF stage. Please see CEO Endorsement stage comment.

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Please elaborate further on how knowledge sharing will be fostered among various stakeholders (communities, technical experts, policymakers, etc.). Also please delineate on user-friendliness in the KM means.

Recommended action: Please consider and elaborate on the above points.

Agency Response

Well noted. The recommendations have been considered and further elaborated in the revised PIF, section 8 (page 31).

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

10/20/2019:

Yes. The endorsement letter from Myanmar’s Operational Focal Point, was signed on October 9, 2019.

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

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

11/7/2019:

YS&FI: Yes. Recommended by the PMs for technical clearance.

11/1/2019:

YS&FI: Not yet. Please refer to the comment on Part I, Section 3 (co-financing).

10/20/2019:

YS&FI: Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/1/2019:

1. Please provide further detail on plans for sustainability of the project outcomes.
2. The proposed KM activities (as described in the PIF) seems more like knowledge capture than knowledge sharing/exchange, as what has been proposed is mostly production of reports. Please also include activities focused on community-to-community sharing of adaptation experiences and know-how.
3. Regarding the 'Climate Change Education Center': Please provide further details on the function, activities, and scale of this proposed center and information on how will it be sustained.
4. Vulnerability assessments: Previous adaptation projects have also supported a range of vulnerability assessments. Please outline clearly how the proposed vulnerability assessments address gaps and priority needs that other assessments have not covered. Please also discuss how the information emerging from these vulnerability assessments will be available for subsequent open access and usage.
5. Risks: Please ensure that relevant political risks have been adequately considered for project design and implementation.
6. Stakeholders: Please provide further information on engagement of CSOs and community groups, and how any ethnic minorities will be engaged and impacted. Please also discuss engagement of youth, women and marginalized groups.
7. Coordination/Co-finance: The mapping exercise that will be undertaken during PPG phase will help to identify key findings and emerging lessons that can be upscaled and outscaled, and also to identify existing gaps. Depending on the outputs of the mapping exercise, please consider opportunities to further increase impact /co-finance of this project, and to reflect this where possible in terms of Core Indicator values.

Review Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|---|------------|-----------------|
| First Review | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |