

My-Coast: Ecosystem-Based Conservation of Myanmar's Southern Coastal Zone

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9261

Countries

Myanmar

Project Name

My-Coast: Ecosystem-Based Conservation of Myanmar's Southern Coastal Zone

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

5/30/2019

Review completed by PM

3/19/2021

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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

(Ikarrar July 2019) The few changes are discussed in the next question.

(Karrer, Nov 2020). Responses to April 2020 comments are missing and from a quick review it seems the comments have not been addressed. Please ensure the CER has been updated and resubmit together with responses. Thanks.

(Karrer, March 3, 2021). Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments Responses to April 2020 addressed in next question

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Ikarrar July 2019) No, The following issues need to be addressed:

1. A critical aspect of this project is the establishment of ICZM strategies at national, regional and local levels. In the PIF Component 1, Outcome 1.1, noted that there would be "national and division policies in place." The Pro Doc Component 1 (national and regional), notes "implementation of a coastal conservation and management strategy" and Outcome 1.1 notes "implementation of an ICZM strategy"; however the subsequent Output and Activities at a national level focus on capacity building, not developing a national ICZM strategy. The Results Matrix in Appendix A does not have a national ICZM strategy as an indicator. National ICZM plans need to be reinserted into the outputs, activities and indicators.

2. There is a related concern for Component 2 (local ? within Tanintharyi) in which Outcome 2.1 is ICZM implemented in southern Myanmar. The majority of the Outputs and Activities are related to capacity building, coordination and monitoring. Output 2.2.3, which is most directly related to ICZM instead focuses on siloed activities and does not reflect the core concept of integrated coastal zone management. Fisheries and habitat measures are clearly important; however, it would seem that a relevant indicator would also be ICZM plans within Tanintharyi that ensured cohesion across the set of otherwise siloed activities.
3. The 3rd identified barrier in the Theory of Change is ?low awareness of the true environmental, socioeconomic and society values?? yet there is virtually no mention (only briefly noted in 1.1.2.2) of plans to assess these aspects. The socioeconomic aspects also need to be incorporated into ICZM plans and the information management system.
4. The project description is inconsistent in its explanation of plans between national, regional and local efforts. Para 113 states Component 1 will focus on national capacities while Component 2 will focus on local capacities within Tanintharyi region. Yet, in reading through C1 and C2, Output 1.1.2 is ?strengthened national and Tanintharyi Region policy frameworks?? and Output 1.1.4 is an ICZM plan for Tanintharyi. Component 2 is noted as ?Capacity-building and implementation of CZM in Tanintharyi Region? and Output 2.1.2 highlights the Tanintharyi CRMC. Further, outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 are noted as ?regional?. The scale of activities needs to be clarified in order to prevent duplication of efforts. The Tanintharyi level activities need either be in C1 OR C2 - not both. If C1 is meant to be national and regional in scale and C2 is meant to be local efforts WITHIN Tanintharyi Region (not the overall region), then the description of plans needs to be revised accordingly.
5. One of the concerns previously noted by STAP and in the PIF review was the importance of stakeholder engagement, particularly engagement with community members. The discussion regarding stakeholder engagement indicated there were ?numerous consultation meetings and four workshops? (para 188). From reading the Appendix IX: Stakeholder Engagement Plan it seemed the vast majority of the meetings were with government officials. There is one table titled ?Township and Village level assessment and consultations? which includes nearly 20 meetings overall several days; however, it is unclear who participated in these meetings which are note simply as ?Community/village level assessments and consultations.? This description needs clarification as to whether community members, business leaders and/or CSO reps participated; otherwise it seems government representatives were the focus of discussions. In considering the list of identified stakeholders (p132-141), it is almost entirely governments or international NGOs. Reconsideration needs to be given to identifying community and private sector participation, including community groups and local business alliances (e.g. fisher

associations, tourism). There is discussion of the community process under FPIC procedures, but it is disconnected from the previous text outlining the stakeholders and how they will be engaged.

6. In reviewing the gender representation during the stakeholder engagement discussions there is a heavy skew toward male participation. This inequity needs to be discussed and measured to address this concern identified in the Pro Doc.

(Karrer, April 26, 2020) No. Please address these points;

- 1) There continues to be confusion by having Tanintharyi ICZM plans/strategy under C1 instead of under C2. In particular: a) Outcome 2.1 is ?Integrated coastal zone management implemented in southern Myanmar?; yet in C1 Output 1.1.4 is ?An integrated coastal zone management strategy for Tanintharyi?. It would make more sense to have all the national activities in C1; all the Tanintharyi activities in C2. b) Outputs 2.2.2 and 2.2.23 refers to decision-making and management, which relate to ICZM which would seem appropriate to improve as part of the ICZM process. Again it would seem to make more sense to have these together in C2.
- 2) 2) The title of C2 needs to be consistent ? in some places it notes ?local? and other places ?in Tanintharyi?. Please ensure consistently ?in Tanintharyi?, not ?local?.
- 3) Please clarify the project **objective** as articulated in Section B. (Project Description Summary) of the PIF (see below). It seems okay in other parts of the ProDoc and CER, but Section B is really garbled. There is no need to include the targets in the objective. The statement should be a clear articulation of the change the project seeks to make, rather than include details of the sites, approaches and results expected. (Hannah)

Project Objective: Improved coastal zone management to benefit marine biodiversity, climate-change mitigation, and food security 1. 900 sq km Tanintharyi coastline covered by integrated strategies or Marine Spatial Plans that include biodiversity conservation, sustainable fisheries management, and climate change 2. 210000 hectares of coastal habitat in Tanintharyi brought under improved community-based/ co-management via Community Fishery or Forestry User Groups and LMMAs supporting ICZM/ Marine spatial planning implementation 3. 5.4 million tonnes Co2Eq sequestered as a result of specific project-supported mangrove conservation and rehabilitation measures 4. 15% in abundance/ size of key fishery and biodiversity of indicator species (e.g. mud crab) in monitored locations from baseline level

- 4) It seems that the project **Outcomes and Outputs** for Object 2 in table section B are reversed. Please revise (outcomes should be general, outputs more specific).
- 5) The FA **outcome** for CCM is missing in table A. It should be ?Outcome A. Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration?.

There are a few points on indicators:

6) The total core **indicator** target is 200,000 hectares of marine/terrestrial under improved management for a \$12 million GEF/co-finance investment, this is an extremely low expected Return On Investment. Please ensure the core indicator targets for Indicators 4 and 5 include the entirety of the area that both Components 1 and 2 intend to impact. For instance: Outcome 1.1 focused on ***national-level ICZM*** and capacity building to implement/apply ICZM effectively. Given the national focus of Component 1 targets should be set that capture the hectares under improved management at the ***national-level*** that the project intends to/will plausibly impact (not just the site focus in Component 2). For the scope of the investment this target would be much more commensurate with the expected impact.

7) Anticipated start year of accounting should be updated in the Core **Indicator** table (it is currently 2019).

8) The **numbers** used for the GHG emissions mitigation calculation (144, 000 ha of mangrove forest showing reduced degradation + 100 ha of mangrove forest restored/rehabilitated) should be consistent with the expected outcomes presented in Table B (respectively 50,000 ha + 200 ha).

9) Please reconsider the **expected area of mangrove restored** which is has been divided by 10 since the PIF! Considering the Forest Department is implementing the National Reforestation and Rehabilitation Program, which is a 10-year initiative (2016 to 2026) as presented in the baseline, we could expect more engagement/alignment from the national authorities in the project sites of intervention. If it is not the case, then it is difficult to see how this is project is a priority for the country.

10) Finally, **the method used for the CCM benefits** looks fine (using the FAO Ex-Act tool) but please upload the entire Ex-Act tool Excel file in the Portal to facilitate the progress review during the project implementation as the benefits come from different sources.

(Karrer, March 3, 2021). Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

Reponses to comments from July 2019 are as follows:

Response to Comment 1: In designing the MyCoast Project, the PPG has followed the PIF Project Description as closely as possible. The PIF, and therefore the ProDoc, focus on capacity-building as the principle requirement to achieve the Project Objective to *?Improve [integrated] coastal zone management??* This priority to support ICZM capacity development is identified by the two components in the PIF *?Component 1: ?National institutional capacity to develop and implement a large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy? and Component 2: ?Local level organizational capacity and action to implement strategic coastal zone conservation management.?* Our interpretation of Component 1 and its single Outcome (*?National and subnational (region/state) capacity built to design and sustain implementation of an integrated*

coastal zone conservation strategy?) is that the *large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy?* refers to the Tanintharyi Region only, not to a national ICZM strategy. This important point is confirmed by PIF Output 1.1. *Model coastal zone conservation strategy for the southern coast?* and the PIF potential indicators for Component 1, which include *Five hundred (500) kilometres of marine coasts and associated habitat monitored to promote conservation of ecosystem services?* This indicator is sub-regional in scale, as the coastline of Tanintharyi is about 900 kms, whereas the total coastline of Myanmar exceeds 2,400 kms. Moreover, the three main coastal regions of the country, Tanintharyi, the Ayeyarwady Delta and Rakhine State differ so markedly in their biogeographical, climatic, socio-economic and other characteristics that it would be beyond a single project, or single strategy, to cover the entire coastline. Thus, the approach taken in the ProDoc is to support the development of the national capacity, policies and sustainable financing mechanisms required for ICZM, while formulating an ICZM strategy for Tanintharyi as a *model?* that can be replicated/adapted to other coastal states/regions. This interpretation is consistent with the PIF para. 44: *The project will build capacities to generate a model coastal zone conservation strategy covering the southern Tanintharyi Region, including the Myeik Archipelago.* And PIF para 47 states that: *The strategy will Provide a spatial plan for the Tanintharyi coastal zones??.* The PIF also recognizes (para. 49) that *Development of the coastal conservation strategy will be approached as a capacity building and training exercise for regional and national decision-makers?.*

Based on the above interpretation of the PIF, but also taking comment 2.1 into account, the ProDoc text has been edited to make the distinction between national, Tanintharyi Region and local plans, and other project activities clearer:

113. The project's objective is ***improved coastal zone management to benefit marine biodiversity, climate-change mitigation, and food security***. The project will have two inter-related components, each supported by one outcome and several outputs. Under Component 1, national and state/region capacities will be developed for the planning and implementation of strategic, integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) and a model ICZM strategy will be generated for the southern Tanintharyi Region of Myanmar. Under Component 2, equivalent local capacities will be built within the Tanintharyi Region and strategic coastal conservation management will be demonstrated in practice in a representative site selected within the Myeik Archipelago. An important feature of the project is that it will operate at all levels from national, to sub-national (state/region) and local (district/township/village) levels.

Consistent with the above, the title of Component 1 has also been revised back to its exact wording in the PIF:

Component 1:

116. National institutional capacity to develop and implement a large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy

It is also considered advisable to keep the ProDoc output 1.1.4 *An integrated coastal zone management strategy for Tanintharyi Region?* under Component 1 (as in the PIF), because of its recognized capacity-building value at national as well as regional level. Furthermore, preparation and approval of an ICZM strategy for Tanintharyi Region will depend heavily on national support, especially development of a national policy framework for ICZM, as well as financial and other assistance from key departments of the Union Government, and especially guidance and approval from the National Coastal Resources Management Committee (NCRMC).

Response to comment 2. It is agreed that, in Component 2, the Outputs and Activities do also focus strongly on capacity-building, as well as on coordination and monitoring (as noted in the Secretariat comments), but this is intentional in order to support this component's aim *'local level organizational capacity and action to implement strategic coastal zone conservation management'* (PIF page 2).

Moreover, the Secretariat comments at #11 seem to endorse this approach: *'The sustainability of the project is ensured through the heavy emphasis on capacity building and institutional coordination'*.

Regarding ProDoc Output 2.2.3, the activities listed are only *'potential'* ones, but they include those identified by local stakeholders as the most urgently needed ones: namely reducing illegal coastal fishing activities and mangrove wood extraction in the proposed ICZM demonstration site. The project will support village level community-managed fishery and mangrove forest conservation and sustainable use areas to help recover and safeguard coastal fishery and forestry resources. It is agreed, as per the Secretariat comment 2.2 that these activities do not constitute a demonstration of ICZM in *sensu stricto*, but they are fundamental to achieving the project's coastal conservation aims of biodiversity protection, climate change mitigation and food security. However, it is also explained in ProDoc para 149 that an ICZM approach will still be applied and demonstrated:

'Although the focus of demonstration will be on integrated mangrove forest and fisheries/aquaculture management, it is considered important from an ICZM perspective to also include demonstration activities in the coastal area adjacent to Myeik Town and the Tenasserim River Estuary, particularly environmental monitoring and reporting. The urban center of Myeik is densely populated and there is rapid industrial and commercial development adjacent to the town, in the form of the harbour and waterfront area, including construction of a tall condominium. There is a large fish landing centre and ship-building yard on Pathaw Island?etc.'

The Secretariat's point that *'a relevant indicator would also be ICZM plans within Tanintharyi'* is also well taken. In response, an ICZM plan for the Myeik demonstration site within Tanintharyi has been added into the project's design as both an activity and indicator.

Response to comment 3. The identified barrier *'low awareness of the true environmental, socio-economic and societal values'* is addressed by project activities suggested not only in 1.1.2.2, but also by Outputs 2.1.3 and 2.2.5. Reference to project efforts to overcome this barrier are also made in paras. 105, 106, 123, 135, 321, 326, 327, 333. The importance of including socio-economic valuation in the project's work is also highlighted in para. 111 under Lessons Learned: *'It is essential to have a solid knowledge base to support coastal conservation initiatives, not only knowledge about the target ecosystems and species for conservation, but also an intimate understanding of their socio-economic importance to resource-dependent communities, including the most vulnerable groups.'*

The specific activities needed to overcome this significant barrier will be designed by an International Environmental Economist (16 person weeks are budgeted for), supported by a National Environmental Economist (22 person weeks). In response to this Secretariat's comment, potential activities to address this barrier have been added to Table 2 and socio-economic considerations have been included in the ICZM plans and information management system.

Response to comment 4. As explained in response to Secretariat comment 1., the ProDoc text has been edited to more clearly identify national, regional (Tanintharyi) and local (within Myeik District) plans and activities.

Response to comment 5. This comment is well received and has been addressed as follows: In Appendix IV: Stakeholder Engagement Plan details of the village community consultations have been added; and it is explained that in the 10 coastal villages surveyed by the PPG team in-depth discussions were held with community leaders, followed by separate meetings with male and female village members, so that women were able to express their views without influence from the presence of men. Engagement with the private sector has also been explained more clearly in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (the PPG team had meetings with the Myanmar Fisheries Federation and Myeik Tourism Association as key private sector stakeholders).

A FPIC process was followed to the extent possible when engaging with local communities during the PPG phase, which included informing village and village group leaders, as well CBOs/NGOs supporting them, about the project and seeking their views on coastal environmental issues affecting their livelihoods and food security. The community meetings were conducted on an 'open' basis and many villagers also attended to both listen and contribute to the discussions. From project start up, FPIC will be implemented with due diligence before any project activities take place that may directly, or indirectly, affect local communities in and around the project sites.

Appendix IV (revised content)

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
--------------------	--

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
Traditional coastal communities	<p>The PPG team consulted with village leaders and villagers in 10 coastal fishing villages within Auckland Bay and on Kodon Island and Thayawthdangyi Island in the central Myeik Archipelago (see locations in Appendix XI). In each village, an initial meeting was convened to explain the MyCoast project to village leaders, and to learn from them about the main environmental and socio-economic issues facing their village. Six of the 10 villages have community forest areas managed by a village Forest User Group (FUG) and FUG members were also present. Issues surrounding natural resources use were discussed in detail. At each village, discussions were then held separately with groups of 10-20 fishermen and 15-30 women (depending on the size of the village) to better understand these issues from a gender perspective; and also, to ask men and women about potential additional livelihood activities they considered to be most suitable for them? A meeting was also held with members of the Forest User Association, which represents the FUGs on Kodon Island. During a second visit to each village, the PPG team members conducted further interviews with natural resources users. In addition, Fishery Co-management groups were consulted in three fishing villages in Dawei District. In total, an estimated 600 villagers and their community/group leaders were consulted during the PPG, with approximately 50:50% participation by women and men.</p> <p>Traditional coastal communities and their representative forestry and fishery groups will be involved in the project mainly through participation in integrated natural resource planning and co-management of coastal and marine resources, but also in other project activities, especially livelihood enhancement activities. Their main interest in the success of the project is that their income/livelihoods will be made more stable and sustainable through enhanced tenure and sustainable management of the resources upon which they depend. This will include assistance to diversify their livelihood activities beyond only capture fisheries (see additional livelihood interests of village women and men in Appendix XI).</p> <p>These communities will influence the outputs of the project through their level of commitment and change in behaviour at the community level (i.e. through participation in planning and management and compliance with strategies and plans developed regulations). In addition, they will also be represented on the project steering committee.</p> <p>Women will benefit from the project through targeted planning, capacity development and livelihood activities most suitable for women.</p> <p>Youth will be involved at community level as local facilitators and they will be trained and supported by the project.</p>

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
<p>local CSOs/NGOs working in Tanintharyi</p>	<p>Various local NGO/CSOs, have and will continue to play an important role in the project. Within each village, and in coordination with other stakeholders, the project will work with the VDCs and village groups. Relevant and experienced NGO/ CSOs will assist in the implementation of project activities, such as facilitating the formation of village natural resource management groups and the preparation of Climate change vulnerability and ICZM plans; and introducing alternative livelihood opportunities.</p> <p>Community mobilization and capacity development activities under the project will be undertaken by local NGO/CSO or, as required, the project will work to strengthen the NGO/CSO themselves through, for example, CSO management and skills training (e.g. on the ecosystem approach to fisheries and aquaculture, training on the use of environmental monitoring systems, and gender mainstreaming). The NGO/CSOs will also facilitate fisher-to-fisher and farmer-to-farmer sharing of information within and across the communities. The role of women will be supported and specific women's groups will be formed as appropriate. During project implementation these methodologies will be further strengthened and a gender strategy will be developed.</p> <p>The knowledge these organisations have of working with local communities in Myeik District will be invaluable to the project, including as potential implementing partners.</p> <p>The following Tanintharyi-based CSOs/NGOs were consulted during the PPG to explain the MyCoast project to them and to confirm their willingness to work with the project and assist the traditional village communities in the project's proposed demonstration site.</p> <p>Conservation Alliance of Tanintharyi (CAT): this alliance has seven member CSO organizations: Tenasserim River and Indigenous People Network; Community Sustainable Livelihood and Development; Tarkapaw Youth Group; Candle Light; Southern Youth; Karen Environmental and Social Action Network; and Tanintharyi Friends. CAT is headquartered in Dawei and its member organisations are based in Dawei or Myeik.</p> <p>Green Network: this is a CSO dedicated to Environmental Conservation, Human Rights Promotion and Public Education in Myeik District. It has extensive experience of supporting the development of FUGs in Kyunsu Township, which will be of great value to MyCoast.</p> <p>Green Network 88: is a CSO helping to create employment opportunities for local communities in Myeik; it is involved in natural resources management, including revising laws relating to fisheries and forestry.</p> <p>Farmers Union: this CSO advocates for farmers' rights and represents farmers affected by 'land-grab', which is a growing problem in Tanintharyi. It also educates farmers about the land laws.</p> <p>ALARM: is an NGO working in Myeik District on gender equality through women's empowerment and natural resources governance (see details paragraph 285).</p> <p>Myeik University Students Union: this student group was formed recently and is just beginning activities, but the group's interests include waste management and applied research.</p>

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
Local business associations	<p>Myanmar Fisheries Federation (MFF):</p> <p>MFF is a national level, non-profit organization with a membership of over 700 companies and 27,000 individuals. Founded in 1989, MFF represents the interests of member enterprises and associations within the fishery industry. MFF aims to promote the socio-economic life of member entrepreneurs and fishery communities, share information on economic policies and fishery technologies and advocate on behalf of the fishing industry, among other objectives. MFF has sub-federations at all state/region, district and township levels. The PPG team held discussions with MFF staff representing the federation at regional level in Tanintharyi and at district level in Dawei and Myeik.</p> <p>There are nine associations under MFF that deal with particular industries, namely, shrimp, fish, exporters, aquaculture feed, marine fisheries, freshwater capture fisheries, crabs, eels and ornamental fish. MFF also includes technical sub-associations for: (1) freshwater aquaculture; (2) offshore capture fisheries; (3) inland fisheries; (4) fish and fishery product export; (5) fish feed; (6) shrimp culture; (7) eel culture and export; and (8) crab culture and export.</p> <p>MFF is expected to play a pivotal role in facilitating consultation between the project and the various commercial fishery sub-sectors, especially by way of encouraging the involvement of MFF members in project activities. MFF can also play a vital role in helping the project and DoF to convince its members of the need to comply with fisheries regulations, especially those designed to protect coastal habitats and vital life-cycle stages of targeted fish and shellfish species.</p> <p>Myeik Tourism Association</p> <p>This is a local business association representing the interests of private tour operators in Myeik District. From a single tourist agency offering local tours in 2013, the number of registered agencies increased to 20 in 2017 and to 32 in 2018. This number is expected to double in the near future in response to the government's promotion of tourism and the hoped-for lifting of restrictions currently preventing foreign tourists from staying overnight on islands in the Myeik Archipelago. The PPG team met with the chairman and some members of this association.</p> <p>As with the MFF, the Myeik Tourism Association can play a key facilitation role in the project on behalf of its members, especially since the association's main objective is sustainable tourism and its main focus for tourism development is the Myeik Archipelago. Its member tour operators are already aware of the environmental impact risks from tourism and the need for strategic development planning. The project can assist the association to adopt codes of good practice by its members and help the local tourism sector to integrate better with other sectors, especially fisheries, and with local coastal communities.</p>

Response to comment 6. It is acknowledged that the greater participation of men compared to women among government and private sector stakeholders during the PPG phase is likely to continue unless the project is proactive in empowering women and encouraging their participation in project activities. For this reason, a detailed gender equality strategy will be prepared early in the project implementation phase by an International Gender and Rural Socio-economic Development consultant (12 person weeks are budgeted for), supported by equivalent National consultant (also for 12 person weeks). Appendix XIV of the ProDoc provides a preliminary Gender Plan with suggested actions to achieve gender equality.

Activities under Output 2.2.4: Improved tenure, livelihoods, food security and climate change adaptation benefits to traditional coastal resource users demonstrated at site level? include identification of and support to additional livelihood activities most suitable for women, plus dedicated support for livelihood development activities by village women's groups (e.g. savings groups).

The following are responses to comments from previous round of reviews

1. In designing the MyCoast Project, the PPG has followed the PIF Project Description as closely as possible. The PIF, and therefore the ProDoc, focus on capacity-building as the principle requirement to achieve the Project Objective to *Improve [integrated] coastal zone management?* This priority to support ICZM capacity development is identified by the two components in the PIF *Component 1: National institutional capacity to develop and implement a large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy?* and *Component 2: Local level organizational capacity and action to implement strategic coastal zone conservation management.?*

Our interpretation of Component 1 and its single Outcome (*National and subnational (region/state) capacity built to design and sustain implementation of an integrated coastal zone conservation strategy?*) is that the *large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy?* refers to the Tanintharyi Region only, not to a national ICZM strategy. This important point is confirmed by PIF Output 1.1. *Model coastal zone conservation strategy for the southern coast?* and the PIF potential indicators for Component 1, which include *Five hundred (500) kilometres of marine coasts and associated habitat monitored to promote conservation of ecosystem services?* This indicator is sub-regional in scale, as the coastline of Tanintharyi is about 900 kms, whereas the total coastline of Myanmar exceeds 2,400 kms. Moreover, the three main coastal regions of the country, Tanintharyi, the Ayeyarwady Delta and Rakhine State differ so markedly in their biogeographical, climatic, socio-economic and other characteristics that it would be beyond a single project, or single strategy, to cover the entire coastline. Thus, the approach taken in the ProDoc is to support the development of the national capacity, policies and sustainable financing mechanisms required for ICZM, while formulating an ICZM strategy for Tanintharyi as a *model?* that can be replicated/adapted to other coastal states/regions. This interpretation is consistent with the PIF para. 44: *The project will build capacities to generate a model coastal zone conservation strategy*

covering the southern Tanintharyi Region, including the Myeik Archipelago.? And PIF para 47 states that: ?The strategy will ?Provide a spatial plan for the Tanintharyi coastal zones??. The PIF also recognizes (para. 49) that ?Development of the coastal conservation strategy will be approached as a capacity building and training exercise for regional and national decision-makers?.

Based on the above interpretation of the PIF, but also taking comment 2.1 into account, the ProDoc text has been edited to make the distinction between national, Tanintharyi Region and local plans, and other project activities clearer:

113. The project's objective is ***improved coastal zone management to benefit marine biodiversity, climate-change mitigation, and food security***. The project will have two inter-related components, each supported by one outcome and several outputs. Under Component 1, national and state/region capacities will be developed for the planning and implementation of strategic, integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) and a model ICZM strategy will be generated for the southern Tanintharyi Region of Myanmar. Under Component 2, equivalent local capacities will be built within the Tanintharyi Region and strategic coastal conservation management will be demonstrated in practice in a representative site selected within the Myeik Archipelago. An important feature of the project is that it will operate at all levels from national, to sub-national (state/region) and local (district/township/village) levels.

Consistent with the above, the title of Component 1 has also been revised back to its exact wording in the PIF:

Component 1:

116. National institutional capacity to develop and implement a large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy

It is also considered advisable to keep the ProDoc output 1.1.4 ?An integrated coastal zone management strategy for Tanintharyi Region? under Component 1 (as in the PIF), because of its recognized capacity-building value at national as well as regional level. Furthermore, preparation and approval of an ICZM strategy for Tanintharyi Region will depend heavily on national support, especially development of a national policy framework for ICZM, as well as financial and other assistance from key departments of the Union Government, and especially guidance and approval from the National Coastal Resources Management Committee (NCRMC).

2. It is agreed that, in Component 2, the Outputs and Activities do also focus strongly on capacity-building, as well as on coordination and monitoring (as noted in the Secretariat comments), but this is intentional in order to support this component's aim ?*local level organizational capacity and action to implement strategic coastal zone conservation management?* (PIF page 2).

Moreover, the Secretariat comments at #11 seem to endorse this approach: *“The sustainability of the project is ensured through the heavy emphasis on capacity building and institutional coordination?”.*

Regarding ProDoc Output 2.2.3, the activities listed are only “potential” ones, but they include those identified by local stakeholders as the most urgently needed ones: namely reducing illegal coastal fishing activities and mangrove wood extraction in the proposed ICZM demonstration site. The project will support village level community-managed fishery and mangrove forest conservation and sustainable use areas to help recover and safeguard coastal fishery and forestry resources. It is agreed, as per the Secretariat comment 2.2 that these activities do not constitute a demonstration of ICZM in *sensu stricto*, but they are fundamental to achieving the project’s coastal conservation aims of biodiversity protection, climate change mitigation and food security. However, it is also explained in ProDoc para 149 that an ICZM approach will still be applied and demonstrated:

“Although the focus of demonstration will be on integrated mangrove forest and fisheries/aquaculture management, it is considered important from an ICZM perspective to also include demonstration activities in the coastal area adjacent to Myeik Town and the Tenasserim River Estuary, particularly environmental monitoring and reporting. The urban center of Myeik is densely populated and there is rapid industrial and commercial development adjacent to the town, in the form of the harbour and waterfront area, including construction of a tall condominium. There is a large fish landing centre and ship-building yard on Pathaw Island?etc.”

The Secretariat’s point that *“a relevant indicator would also be ICZM plans within Tanintharyi?”* is also well taken. In response, an ICZM plan for the Myeik demonstration site within Tanintharyi has been added into the project’s design as both an activity and indicator.

3. The identified barrier “low awareness of the true environmental, socio-economic and societal values” is addressed by project activities suggested not only in 1.1.2.2, but also by Outputs 2.1.3 and 2.2.5. Reference to project efforts to overcome this barrier are also made in paras. 105, 106, 123, 135, 321, 326, 327, 333. The importance of including socio-economic valuation in the project’s work is also highlighted in para. 111 under Lessons Learned: “It is essential to have a solid knowledge base to support coastal conservation initiatives, not only knowledge about the target ecosystems and species for conservation, but also an intimate understanding of their socio-economic importance to resource-dependent communities, including the most vulnerable groups.”

The specific activities needed to overcome this significant barrier will be designed by an International Environmental Economist (16 person weeks are budgeted for), supported by a National Environmental Economist (22 person weeks). In response to this Secretariat’s comment, potential activities to address this barrier have been added to

Table 2 and socio-economic considerations have been included in the ICZM plans and information management system.

4. As explained in response to Secretariat comment 1., the ProDoc text has been edited to more clearly identify national, regional (Tanintharyi) and local (within Myeik District) plans and activities.

5. This comment is well received and has been addressed as follows: In Appendix IV: Stakeholder Engagement Plan details of the village community consultations have been added; and it is explained that in the 10 coastal villages surveyed by the PPG team in-depth discussions were held with community leaders, followed by separate meetings with male and female village members, so that women were able to express their views without influence from the presence of men. Engagement with the private sector has also been explained more clearly in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (the PPG team had meetings with the Myanmar Fisheries Federation and Myeik Tourism Association as key private sector stakeholders).

A FPIC process was followed to the extent possible when engaging with local communities during the PPG phase, which included informing village and village group leaders, as well CBOs/NGOs supporting them, about the project and seeking their views on coastal environmental issues affecting their livelihoods and food security. The community meetings were conducted on an 'open' basis and many villagers also attended to both listen and contribute to the discussions. From project start up, FPIC will be implemented with due diligence before any project activities take place that may directly, or indirectly, affect local communities in and around the project sites.

Appendix IV (revised content)

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
--------------------	--

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
Traditional coastal communities	<p>The PPG team consulted with village leaders and villagers in 10 coastal fishing villages within Auckland Bay and on Kodon Island and Thayawthdangyi Island in the central Myeik Archipelago (see locations in Appendix XI). In each village, an initial meeting was convened to explain the MyCoast project to village leaders, and to learn from them about the main environmental and socio-economic issues facing their village. Six of the 10 villages have community forest areas managed by a village Forest User Group (FUG) and FUG members were also present. Issues surrounding natural resources use were discussed in detail. At each village, discussions were then held separately with groups of 10-20 fishermen and 15-30 women (depending on the size of the village) to better understand these issues from a gender perspective; and also, to ask men and women about potential additional livelihood activities they considered to be most suitable for them? A meeting was also held with members of the Forest User Association, which represents the FUGs on Kodon Island. During a second visit to each village, the PPG team members conducted further interviews with natural resources users. In addition, Fishery Co-management groups were consulted in three fishing villages in Dawei District. In total, an estimated 600 villagers and their community/group leaders were consulted during the PPG, with approximately 50:50% participation by women and men.</p> <p>Traditional coastal communities and their representative forestry and fishery groups will be involved in the project mainly through participation in integrated natural resource planning and co-management of coastal and marine resources, but also in other project activities, especially livelihood enhancement activities. Their main interest in the success of the project is that their income/livelihoods will be made more stable and sustainable through enhanced tenure and sustainable management of the resources upon which they depend. This will include assistance to diversify their livelihood activities beyond only capture fisheries (see additional livelihood interests of village women and men in Appendix XI).</p> <p>These communities will influence the outputs of the project through their level of commitment and change in behaviour at the community level (i.e. through participation in planning and management and compliance with strategies and plans developed regulations). In addition, they will also be represented on the project steering committee.</p> <p>Women will benefit from the project through targeted planning, capacity development and livelihood activities most suitable for women.</p> <p>Youth will be involved at community level as local facilitators and they will be trained and supported by the project.</p>

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
<p>local CSOs/NGOs working in Tanintharyi</p>	<p>Various local NGO/CSOs, have and will continue to play an important role in the project. Within each village, and in coordination with other stakeholders, the project will work with the VDCs and village groups. Relevant and experienced NGO/ CSOs will assist in the implementation of project activities, such as facilitating the formation of village natural resource management groups and the preparation of Climate change vulnerability and ICZM plans; and introducing alternative livelihood opportunities.</p> <p>Community mobilization and capacity development activities under the project will be undertaken by local NGO/CSO or, as required, the project will work to strengthen the NGO/CSO themselves through, for example, CSO management and skills training (e.g. on the ecosystem approach to fisheries and aquaculture, training on the use of environmental monitoring systems, and gender mainstreaming). The NGO/CSOs will also facilitate fisher-to-fisher and farmer-to-farmer sharing of information within and across the communities. The role of women will be supported and specific women's groups will be formed as appropriate. During project implementation these methodologies will be further strengthened and a gender strategy will be developed.</p> <p>The knowledge these organisations have of working with local communities in Myeik District will be invaluable to the project, including as potential implementing partners.</p> <p>The following Tanintharyi-based CSOs/NGOs were consulted during the PPG to explain the MyCoast project to them and to confirm their willingness to work with the project and assist the traditional village communities in the project's proposed demonstration site.</p> <p>Conservation Alliance of Tanintharyi (CAT): this alliance has seven member CSO organizations: Tenasserim River and Indigenous People Network; Community Sustainable Livelihood and Development; Tarkapaw Youth Group; Candle Light; Southern Youth; Karen Environmental and Social Action Network; and Tanintharyi Friends. CAT is headquartered in Dawei and its member organisations are based in Dawei or Myeik.</p> <p>Green Network: this is a CSO dedicated to Environmental Conservation, Human Rights Promotion and Public Education in Myeik District. It has extensive experience of supporting the development of FUGs in Kyunso Township, which will be of great value to MyCoast.</p> <p>Green Network 88: is a CSO helping to create employment opportunities for local communities in Myeik; it is involved in natural resources management, including revising laws relating to fisheries and forestry.</p> <p>Farmers Union: this CSO advocates for farmers' rights and represents farmers affected by 'land-grab', which is a growing problem in Tanintharyi. It also educates farmers about the land laws.</p> <p>ALARM: is an NGO working in Myeik District on gender equality through women's empowerment and natural resources governance (see details paragraph 285).</p> <p>Myeik University Students Union: this student group was formed recently and is just beginning activities, but the group's interests include waste management and applied research.</p>

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Profile, Responsibilities and Expected Involvement with the Project</i>
Local business associations	<p>Myanmar Fisheries Federation (MFF):</p> <p>MFF is a national level, non-profit organization with a membership of over 700 companies and 27,000 individuals. Founded in 1989, MFF represents the interests of member enterprises and associations within the fishery industry. MFF aims to promote the socio-economic life of member entrepreneurs and fishery communities, share information on economic policies and fishery technologies and advocate on behalf of the fishing industry, among other objectives. MFF has sub-federations at all state/region, district and township levels. The PPG team held discussions with MFF staff representing the federation at regional level in Tanintharyi and at district level in Dawei and Myeik.</p> <p>There are nine associations under MFF that deal with particular industries, namely, shrimp, fish, exporters, aquaculture feed, marine fisheries, freshwater capture fisheries, crabs, eels and ornamental fish. MFF also includes technical sub-associations for: (1) freshwater aquaculture; (2) offshore capture fisheries; (3) inland fisheries; (4) fish and fishery product export; (5) fish feed; (6) shrimp culture; (7) eel culture and export; and (8) crab culture and export.</p> <p>MFF is expected to play a pivotal role in facilitating consultation between the project and the various commercial fishery sub-sectors, especially by way of encouraging the involvement of MFF members in project activities. MFF can also play a vital role in helping the project and DoF to convince its members of the need to comply with fisheries regulations, especially those designed to protect coastal habitats and vital life-cycle stages of targeted fish and shellfish species.</p> <p>Myeik Tourism Association</p> <p>This is a local business association representing the interests of private tour operators in Myeik District. From a single tourist agency offering local tours in 2013, the number of registered agencies increased to 20 in 2017 and to 32 in 2018. This number is expected to double in the near future in response to the government's promotion of tourism and the hoped-for lifting of restrictions currently preventing foreign tourists from staying overnight on islands in the Myeik Archipelago. The PPG team met with the chairman and some members of this association.</p> <p>As with the MFF, the Myeik Tourism Association can play a key facilitation role in the project on behalf of its members, especially since the association's main objective is sustainable tourism and its main focus for tourism development is the Myeik Archipelago. Its member tour operators are already aware of the environmental impact risks from tourism and the need for strategic development planning. The project can assist the association to adopt codes of good practice by its members and help the local tourism sector to integrate better with other sectors, especially fisheries, and with local coastal communities.</p>

6. It is acknowledged that the greater participation of men compared to women among government and private sector stakeholders during the PPG phase is likely to continue unless the project is proactive in empowering women and encouraging their participation in project activities. For this reason, a detailed gender equality strategy will be prepared early in the project implementation phase by an International Gender and Rural Socio-economic Development consultant (12 person weeks are budgeted for), supported by equivalent National consultant (also for 12 person weeks). Appendix XIV of the ProDoc provides a preliminary Gender Plan with suggested actions to achieve gender equality.

Activities under Output 2.2.4: Improved tenure, livelihoods, food security and climate change adaptation benefits to traditional coastal resource users demonstrated at site level? include identification of and support to additional livelihood activities most suitable for women, plus dedicated support for livelihood development activities by village women's groups (e.g. savings groups).

Responses to review comments made on 26 April 2020

In response to comments 1, 2, and 4 the project's result framework has been updated to ensure further clarity. These changes are highlighted in pink/ purple colour in the main project document. It was not possible to retain the highlights in the portal for Table B, unfortunately. The main text of the document has these changes highlighted as well.

In response to comment 3, the indicators for Objective level have been removed from the Table.

For comment 5: the FA Outcome has been inserted.

6. The overall impact of the project has been estimated around 4.7 million ha. This has been included under indicator 5. The explanation for this has been included in the box under the indicators sheet.

7. The year of accounting has been updated to 2021.

8. In the light of newly available published information (2018-2020) on the mangroves in Tanintharyi, plus on-going current research into the status of region's seagrass meadows, the numbers for the GHG emission mitigation calculations have been completely revised and improved using Tier 2 values in the EX-ACT program. These recalculations are explained in detail in a new Appendix included in the revised ProDoc (XVII: Mangrove Forest, Seagrass Meadow and Soil Biomass/ Carbon Data used to Estimate the Potential Carbon Emissions Reduction by the Project) and summarized in the ProDoc in section 1.3.4 Global Environmental Benefits, paragraph 164 as below:

164. The following GHG calculations are based on a figure of 240,000 ha for the total area of mangrove forest in Tanintharyi Region. It was assumed that 110,000 ha of mangrove within and around the project ICZM demonstration site just south of Myeik Town will be at risk of further degradation by wood extraction for timber and charcoal-making. And it was assumed that the other 130,000 ha will be mainly at risk from deforestation. Although forest degradation and deforestation are not exclusive processes, this was done to eliminate any risk of double-accounting in the GHG calculations. However, based on recent history, and future development plans, mangroves in Dawei and Kawthaung districts, and those north of Myeik Town are most at risk of conversion for agricultural, industrial or urban expansion (Gaw et al., 2018). A full analysis was conducted on the available estimates of carbon stored in mangrove vegetation and soils in order to determine Tier 2 values to input into the Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT) version 8.6. This analysis, which is based heavily on very recent mangrove forest studies in Myanmar, Thailand and other Southeast Asia countries, is provided in Appendix XVII.

The revised estimate of GHG mitigation is much-increased to about 15 million tCO₂-eq over 20 years as a significant contribution to the project's GEBs.

Regarding mangrove forest degradation, the project approach will be to support the Forest Department (FD)'s efforts to reduce the rate of degradation and promote natural forest recovery. The latter will be aided by forest gap-filling (assisted regeneration) chiefly through the mechanism of supporting Community Forest (CF) groups and expanding the forest area under CF management. The FD's targets for establishing mangrove plantations in Tanintharyi will also be increased severalfold in collaboration with the FD, other projects and the private sector (see Response 9).

9. Although the Forest Department (FD) is implementing the National Reforestation and Rehabilitation Plan (NRRP), the Head of the Mangrove Unit in the Watershed Division of FD advised the PPG team from the outset that large-scale restoration in the form of mangrove plantations is not being considered in Tanintharyi because the region still has extensive mangrove cover.

This policy was reconfirmed in an email from the Forest Department to FAO Myanmar on 23 August 2020, with the following statements and targets reiterated:

As you are aware that the mangroves of Tanintharyi Region are under good condition and we (FD) have a plan for a small area of mangrove plantation every year. You are also right that we focus on the community forestry development in the region because over 60% of the region's total mangrove forested area is under local management (currently about 40 % of mangrove forests is under permanent forest estate).

According to your questions, I would like to reply the following points for your further references,

1. MRRP target of mangrove plantation in Tanintharyi Region (2020-2024)

Year	Targeted Plantation Area (Acres)
------	----------------------------------

2020-2021	50
2021-2022	40
2022-2023	40
2023-2024	40
total	170

2. Mangrove Plantation Target by FDCCA (Danida project) at Kawthaung District

Year	Targeted Plantation Area (Acres)
2020-2021	100
2021-2022	100
total	200

3. Permanent Forest Estate of Tanintharyi Region (Reserved Forest and Protected Public Forest of Mangroves)

- ? Totally 15 mangrove PFE (228,739.99 acres) has been established from 2019-2020 in Tanintharyi Region
- 4. Plan to constitute mangrove PFE in Tanintharyi Region
- ? 19 mangrove PFE (187,908.60 acres) under planning/ official processes
- 5. Areas assigned to CF groups (up to 2019-2020)
- ? 4912.29 acres have been awarded to CF users? groups.

As tabled above, the FD target for the four years 2020-2024 under the MRRP project is only 170 acres, or about 69 hectares, plus a further 200 acres (about 81 ha) with support from a climate change adaptation project (FDCCA) funded by DANIDA and identified as a co-financing commitment from the FD to MyCoast.

Collectively, via collaboration with the FD, Community Forest and Fishery groups, other projects and the private sector, the revised target in the ProDoc is now restoration of 1,100 ha (lower estimate) to 1500 ha (higher estimate) of mangroves over the four project years. This brings the project and partner target close to that suggested in the PIF of 1,000 to 2,500 ha. However, even 1,100 ha represents an ambitious target, particularly because the FD can only undertake mangrove restoration in areas under FD jurisdiction ? that is, areas designated as Reserve Forest or Public Protected Forest. For this reason, the project will advocate strongly to inform and encourage the growing private sector in Myanmar to also invest in mangrove restoration, not only as a CSR activity, but also because it makes sound business sense for companies facing risks to their investments from climate change. The ProDoc has been revised accordingly:

169. ? the project will support the FD and Community Forest groups to increase planned restoration targets by 850 or 1,050 ha over four years. In addition, it is expected that large commercial enterprises operating on coastal land can be encouraged by the project to plant mangroves - this is now a common practice in other Southeast Asian countries, where the private sectors regard mangrove restoration as a valuable activity under their corporate social responsibility programs. In addition, in some cases, mangrove planting is carried out by companies to protect their investment infrastructure

e.g. as protection for aquaculture farms from storm damage, or to reduce the risk of coastal land erosion.

170. We assumed that 1,100 ha of mangroves will be restored over the four-year project period, including 150 ha of mangrove plantations already planned by the FD and 100 ha (assumed) by private enterprises encouraged by the project (lower estimate). This leads to an estimated mitigation potential of -275,598 tCO₂-e over a 20 years analysis, or about 13,780 tCO₂-e per year.

10 Two sheets have been uploaded, one with lower estimate and another with a higher one.

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

(Ikarrar July 2019) No, The following issues need to be addressed:

1. The co-financing is not indicated in the budget. The over \$9M co-financing contributions need to be reflected in the budget.
2. The budget is fine except there is not a position for knowledge sharing, which is not the same as communications. KS requires distilling, synthesizing, analyzing and then sharing lessons learned from the project experience with ICZM; whereas communications is focused on reporting activities (e.g. meetings, events). The communications position could disseminate the knowledge findings, but would require different skills for eliciting the lessons learned.
3. The budget totals to \$3,052,347; whereas the proposed total for the grant is \$3,046,347.

(Karrer, April 26, 2020) No.

1. The brief table in Appendix III is not sufficient. A detailed budget needs to be provided at a minimum at the output level, including contributions from the co-financing sources and the contributions e.g. staff, equipment, etc.
2. To ensure knowledge sharing occurs, additional funding needs to be allocated beyond the annual workshops. There are also plans for a webinars, newsletters, participation in relevant events and stakeholder exchanges with other projects. These activities require funding.

(Karrer/PPO, March 26, 2021). No.

There are a few concerns related to the budget (uploaded as separate document):

- 1) The budget does not include detailed explanations. For example, line 7 charged to the PMC does not stipulate what it includes. Please provide an explanation of what is covered by the PMC.
- 2) The Project Coordinator additional expenses should be charged to the PMC. If charged to the components, TORs reflecting the specific contribution to the components are required.
- 3) Rental of boats (40K) and fuel (20K) are preferably paid with co-financing funds.

(Karrer/PPO, April 22, 2021): Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

The following are responses to comments made in July 2019

Response to comment 1. The co-financing figures have been included in APPENDIX III: BUDGET as requested.

Response to comment 2. This point is well made. In project year 1, the priority will be to a) communicate a clear understanding of the project to stakeholders (especially regarding ICZM); and b) to develop an effective communication system between the project and its stakeholders and partners. An international Information Management System (IMS) consultant (4 person weeks) will advise on the setting up and operation of the project's IMS in years 1 and 2.

Once communications are well-developed, and project results are emerging, there will be a growing need for knowledge management (as noted by the comment), including eliciting lessons learned. A national Communications Specialist (104 person weeks) is specified in the budget to assist the project staff with reporting activities; and there is another national consultant position to support Information Management and IT (also 104 person weeks). Recognizing that national consultants or project staff with the skill sets required for Communications, Information Management and Knowledge-Sharing in the environmental field may be in very short supply in Myanmar, it is preferred to give the project team the flexibility to use these person weeks to build the best available team for these tasks.

It is also our experience from other projects, that the CTA and international consultants are well-placed to draw out lessons learned from project results, and through stakeholder consultation and feedback. Project Knowledge-sharing workshops (16 are budgeted for) have been included as a dedicated mechanism for knowledge dissemination.

Response to comment 3. USD 6,000 has been cut from the project budget to match the PIF figure of USD 3,046,347. This has been taken from ?Miscellaneous and contingencies? budget line.

Responses to comments made in April 2020

1. Two Excel budget sheets have been uploaded, and these are also in Appendix III in the revised ProDoc. These contain:

A. An Overall Budget by source of funds, including co-financing, shown by Component (and Outcome) and by project years (1- Next sheet has co-financing figures by output as requested

B. A Results-based Budget by Component and by project year with specific budget lines under each of the main categories, staff, consultants, travel, meetings, procurement, etc. As per the new GEG Guidelines (2020), eligible M&E costs are shown in a separate budget column.

C. An Output-based Budget showing the allocation of GEF funds and co-financing to each output.

2. In addition to the annual results and experiences workshops (USD 8,000 x 4), a budget line of USD 16,000 has been included in the Results-based Budget Table for ?Other stakeholder events and e-learning activities?. There is also a substantial budget allocation for Information Technology (IT) and other services (USD 57,000).

Responses to comments made in March 2021

1) the budget is categorized into FAO's budget headings such as Salaried professionals etc. Please refer to cells A7, A16, A30, A47, A71, A75, A88, A91, A 100 and A113 which describe the key use of the budget. Line 7 charged to PMC is for a staff member, and the budget description has been updated to clarify that and the TOR for this position has been highlighted in Annex with TORs in the main project document.

2. The Project Coordinator position has been now partially charged to PMC as suggested. The technical roles of this person for Components 1 and 2 have been highlighted in revised TOR in the project document's appendix.

3. We anticipate that some of the fuel would be cofinance by the government but this budget is already in addition to that. In our discussions with the government, it was clarified that currently cofinance is not possible for boats.

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 (lkarrer July 2019) Yes, Climate change concerns are addressed throughout the project plans.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(lkarrer July 2019) No, Of the \$9.3M co-financing, only \$100K is grant. The remaining amount is \$9.2M is in-kind. There needs to be a higher commitment to this project by contributing real funding beyond this small amount of in-kind support.

Also, as noted in question 3, the co-financing needs to be indicated in the budget.

(Karrer, April 26, 2020) No.

The co-financing is still quite low. Has there been any progress with Norway or other sources?

(Karrer, March 3, 2021). Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

Response to July 2019 comments: Two additional sources of co-financing have been secured in the form of new investments by a) WorldFish (USD 150,000) from a project to develop an ICZM plan for Lampi Island in Tanintharyi Region; and b) the Norwegian Embassy in Myanmar (USD 1.8 million) from the MYANOR Fish (Myanmar-Norway Fisheries Development Program), which will also have a focus on Tanintharyi Region . The agreed collaboration by WorldFish and Norway with MyCoast has been confirmed via letters of commitment. The total co-financing is now USD 11.25 million; details are shown in the table below:

Component (USD)	GEF	Co-financing (USD)						Total
		DoF	FD	Norway	World Fish	FAO-	Total Co Finance	
Component 1	1,100,850	3,664,000	594,000	850,000		370,000	5,478,000	6,578,850
Component 2	1,650,150	2,786,000	1,538,730	950,000	150,000	350,000	5,774,730	7,424,880
Project M&E	150,300							150,300
Project M?ment Cost	145,047							145,047
Total	3,046,347	6,450,000	2,132,730	1,800,000	150,000	720,000	11,252,730	14,299,077

Response to April 2020 comments

Two additional sources of co-financing have been secured in the form of new investments by a) WorldFish (USD 150,000) from a project to develop an ICZM plan for Lampi Island in Tanintharyi Region; and b) the Norwegian Embassy in Myanmar (USD 1.8 million) from the MYANOR Fish (Myanmar-Norway Fisheries Development Program), which will also have a focus on Tanintharyi Region . The agreed collaboration by WorldFish and Norway with MyCoast has been confirmed via letters of commitment.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(Ikarrar July 2019) No, these are not included. They are available [here](#) for BD and [here](#) for CCM. Please include in revision.

(Karrer, April 26, 2020) Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments As discussed, TT are no longer required.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not Relevant

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 (Ikarrar July 2019)

Yes, The project is aligned with national commitments related to CCM, CCA, Fisheries, BD, Forestry and SDGs. Further, the section on institutional coordination indicates that the project will work with the BOBLME project and this commitment is reiterated in the knowledge management section. However, it would have been useful to note in the opening section the linkages with the BOBLME Strategic Action Programme, which are actually noted in para 276.

Response to Secretariat comments

Reference to the BoBLME SAP has been added in the section National Context (paragraph 13) in the project document.

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 (Ikarrer July 2019) Yes. These are clearly articulated in Table B and Appendix I: Results Matrix. The related STAP concerns have been addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Ikarrer July 2019)

No, The project plans to develop a comprehensive knowledge management and communication strategy, which will be an important aspect of the project. It is also useful to see that consideration has been given to HOW to share lessons ? e.g. workshops, social media, posters, website, newsletter etc as noted in para 246 and 247. The description also notes these lessons will be shared with stakeholders within the project and well as with other projects, which is important as well. One point ? it is important in addition to the one way communication informing stakeholders of experiences, to also have two-way interactions which are far more conducive to learning and adopting new approaches. Two-way interactions can include interactive webinars, focus groups and workshops.

That said, the description of the KMC does not state WHAT knowledge will actually be shared. This is extremely important. Para 244 lists a series of actions; yet only sub-bullet 244d notes the knowledge refers to ?best practices in coastal ecosystems management.? Presumably the knowledge will be lessons learned in how to plan and implement ICZM (the focus of the project). Ascertaining these lessons will require distilling, synthesizing and sharing the lessons from the project process of ICZM. To be clear research involving data collection and analysis of fish stocks, water quality, use patterns, demographics etc are not part of knowledge management. Para 247 implies research findings will be the focus of knowledge management, which needs correcting. Also it should not be communicating that meetings occurred and reports were prepared ? the knowledge needs to be focused on learnings from the project experience of developing and implementing ICZM plans - what were the key barriers, how were these overcome, who were key players, what role did they play, what opportunities instilled change, what processes would you recommend (or not recommend) for other projects. In summary ? in the revision of the Pro Doc the substance of what knowledge will be shared needs to be detailed.

The KS plans, including the analysis of lessons learned, need to be reflected in the project activities. Component 1 activity 1.1.5.4 references an annual workshop to share experiences which is great, but there is no mention of an analysis of lessons learned. Activity 1.1.6.7 notes 'lessons learned developed?', which implies an analysis of project experience but this is not explicit. It needs to be clear that there will be analysis and communication of the project ICZM experiences. Similarly, Component 2 does not indicate that there will be any analysis or sharing of the project ICZM experience. This analysis and communication needs to be reflected in the C2 activities.

Finally, while this project is funded through BD and CC, the substance is highly relevant to International Waters, which has the IWLEARN knowledge platform. This project is strongly encouraged to share experiences through IWLEARN, which includes participating in conferences (IW Learn biannual, LME annual), trainings, workshops, webinars, listserv discussions, results and experience notes, twinnings and cross-project synthesis products.

(Karrer, April 26, 2020) Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

These are all helpful comments and they have reflected in the revised ProDoc text. IWLEARN was mentioned (paragraph 252), but the value to the project of information-sharing via IWLEARN has now been elaborated.

243. Knowledge management and effective communication are most critical to the success of MyCoast because the project will have an important capacity-building and coordinating role. For this reason, the project will develop a comprehensive knowledge management and communication (KMC) strategy capable of delivering existing and new knowledge to support capacity development for ICZM, as well as for communicating between multiple levels and diverse stakeholders with Myanmar society from the Union, Region and District levels to the Townships, rural communities and commercial sectors in the coastal zone of Tanintharyi. The KMC strategy will extract, synthesise and package knowledge for dissemination. It will apply a lessons learned approach based on the ICZM five-stage process cycle taught in the ICZM training programs at national to region and district to community levels (Outputs 1.1.1 and 2.2.1, respectively). The-five stage ICZM cycle is part of Module 3 of the ICZM curriculum. Entitled 'Management Approaches and Tools for ICZM' (see Appendix XV), Module 3 teaches how to plan, resource (including financing), implement, evaluate and learn from ICZM projects and programs.

244. The goal of the project KMC strategy will be to: *Generate, disseminate and apply knowledge to support sustainable management of coastal ecosystems and their living resources.* This goal will be achieved through a number of actions:

- a) Strengthening the knowledge and information base available to the Union and Region/State authorities to plan and apply ICZM in Myanmar;
- b) Providing knowledge and information to meet the specific capacity development and awareness-raising needs of policy-makers, resource managers, commercial sectors, coastal communities and civil society;

- c) Integrating traditional knowledge and practices with relevant scientific evidence-based information;
- d) Promoting effective use of knowledge, especially best practices in coastal ecosystems management;
- e) Communicating effectively, both within the project's management structure, including to its key implementing partners; and externally to other stakeholders and partners within Myanmar and the Bay of Bengal region. Two-way communication and knowledge-sharing between the project and its stakeholders and partners will be strongly encouraged.

245. The KMC strategy will gather knowledge on ICZM planning and implementation by analysing results and lessons learned from other coastal projects in Myanmar and the South and Southeast Asia regions, as well as from the MyCoast project process. This knowledge will be invaluable in supporting the project's capacity development activities. The KMC strategy will both enhance and be supported by an ICZM information management system, which is one of the outputs under Component 1.

The following project activities have also been reworded to emphasize the importance of two-way interaction and analyse lessons learned:

1.1.5.4 An annual workshop to interact with key stakeholders and other projects/programs and development partners, and share results, experiences and analyse lessons learned from ICZM implementation and other project experiences.

1.1.6.7 Project achievements and lessons learned (from Activity 1.1.5.4) packaged and communicated in appropriate formats to meet the learning needs of different target audiences

Agency Responses

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

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Ikarrer July 2019) Yes, the Pro Doc addresses the identified at the PIF review as needing to be addressed during PPG. Appendix X articulates how these are addressed. In addition:

1. Regarding how innovativeness, sustainability and upscaling will be achieved, the Pro Doc highlights the unique aspect of ICZM particularly for Myanmar and its community in section 3.4. Regarding scaling, the local to regional to national aspects of the project ensures lessons will be shared for scaling up to other areas throughout Myanmar. In addition ties to regional projects, including BOBLME SAP implementation project, will help scale the project to other countries. The sustainability of the project is ensured through the heavy emphasis on capacity building and institutional coordination.

2. The concerns regarding engagement with communities were addressed as noted in Question 2.
3. Regarding the number of households that will benefit, this number has been reduced to 3,000 which is in keeping with the affected population.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Ikarrar July 2019) Yes, These comments are adequately addressed in the response (Appendix X) except: While ICZM is the central principle of the project, there still tends to be a focus on forestry and MPA focus with very little discussion of fisheries (both small scale and commercial). In particular para 130 provides a list of elements for ICZM which are heavily focused on protected areas, biodiversity and forestry with no mention of fisheries. The response indicates that commercial is beyond the scope of the project; however, at least small scale fisheries needs to be considered for ICZM to be effective.

Response to Secretariat comments

This comment is well-taken, and para. 130 has been edited as shown below:

- d) Identify sites of highest biodiversity conservation importance, including critical coral, seagrass, and mangrove forest areas; describe the priority conservation and management needs and actions for each; evaluate the socio-economic importance of these ecosystems to traditional resource users ? especially inshore fishers and gleaners; and estimate the full socio-economic value of their ecosystem services to society.
- e) In relation to the socio-economic dependency of inshore fishers and gleaners on coastal ecosystems, evaluate and prioritize potential expansions of marine protected areas (MPAs) and other spatial management tools, such as Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA), and initiatives to increase the connectivity between different protected areas;

We would also like to point out that the strong focus on mangroves is for several reasons: (a) there is still time to ?save? the mangroves in Tanintharyi, without which the highly sensitive coral reef and seagrass ecosystems would become much more vulnerable to smothering and mortality from sediments that the mangrove forests otherwise trap and consolidate; (b) all the coastal villages in the proposed ICZM demonstration site in the Auckland Bay area of Myeik depend on mangrove-associated fish, shrimp and crabs; and all the households use mangrove wood for fuel; and this is also the case throughout coastal Myanmar: (c) ICZM can only be achieved in the country by assisting the government to change away from its strongly sector-based management system to a more integrated one; (d) mangrove conservation and rehabilitation are vital as a means of protecting the far more vulnerable coral reef and sea grass ecosystems, which are at great risk from land-based sedimental, pollution and

climate change. Moreover, since mangroves come under a different ministry and department (MoNREC and Forest Department) to fisheries, which are under MoALI and Department of Fisheries, the focus in the project on managing mangroves to conserve both their fishery and forestry resources should provide a strong incentive for these ministries and departments to cooperate much more than they have traditionally.

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Ikarrer July 2019) There were no Council comments.

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Ikarrer July 2019) There were no Convention comments.

Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request (Ikarrer July 2019) NO, The above points need to be addressed.

(Karrer, April 26, 2020) No.

(Karrer, March 26, 2021). No. Please see above budget-related points i #3. Also please note that guidance is expected from the UN regarding projects in Myanmar, which will need to be considered.

(Karrer, April 22, 2021) Yes. The points have been addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments
Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/11/2019	3/9/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2020	10/14/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2021	2/24/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The My-Coast project is designed to improve coastal zone management to benefit marine biodiversity, climate-change mitigation, and food security in Myanmar. The project will strengthen national and sub-national institutional capacity for ICZM, including improved national policies, strategic planning and a sound knowledge base for informed decision-making. The project will also build organizational capacity and action to implement strategic coastal zone conservation management in Tanintharyi Region, with specific focus on the coastal habitats and biodiversity in the Myeik Archipelago.

MyCoast Project will pioneer integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) in Myanmar as an alternative to unsustainable sector-driven exploitation of coastal and marine living resources. This approach is innovative, not only in Myanmar, where integrated management is a largely unknown management concept, but also throughout Asia. Myanmar will be among the first countries in the Bay of Bengal region to develop and implement an integrated coastal zone conservation strategy. The project will also be innovative in reaching out strategically to gain support for coastal conservation from the many commercial sectors that are becoming increasingly significant in the coastal zone, including tourism, oil and gas, mining, agriculture and aquaculture.

The project will emphasize sustainability by building institutional capacity and developing sustainable financing mechanisms. The cross-sectoral, public-private, interagency collaboration will ensure strong support for the project activities in the short

and long-term. The financing mechanisms, some of which may fall under the broad category of "payment for ecosystem services", will help ensure sufficient funding in the future. Finally, the site-specific focus will be scaled to other regions further ensuring the project activities are continued.

The project will also support the piloting of a coastal zone conservation strategy and associated support mechanisms along a relatively small percentage of Myanmar's coastline. The tools and capacities developed through the project will be designed for national level replication and upscaling. Mechanisms will be established for the project's stakeholders to capture lessons learned, generate and distribute materials required to assist other regions and states to benefit from project results and lessons learned in Tanintharyi Region. Replication and scaling up will also be facilitated through collaboration with other donor-supported coastal management projects. The project's contributions to coastal zone management policy development and sustainable financing mechanisms will also encourage national upscaling. The coastal conservation strategy will also serve as a valuable case study for the BOBLME regional platform. Thus, the project will be well-positioned to contribute results and lessons learned to the BOBLME program of eight countries, including Myanmar, and to facilitate upscaling of best practices applied by the project throughout the Bay of Bengal region.