



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Project Title: Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Area Management in Myanmar | | | |
| Country(ies): | Myanmar | GEF Project ID: ¹ | 5159 |
| GEF Agency(ies): | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 5162 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry, Wildlife Conservation Society | Submission Date: | September 3, 2014 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): | Biodiversity | Project Duration(Months) | 60 months |
| Name of Parent Program (if applicable): | N/A | Project Agency Fee (\$): | \$572,603 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

| Focal Area Objectives | Expected FA Outcomes | Expected FA Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Cofinancing (\$) |
|----------------------------|---|--|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| BD1 | 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new PAs | 1.1. New protected areas (7) and coverage (2,976,833) of unprotected ecosystems and 1.2 unprotected threatened species (100) | GEF TF | 4,800,000 | 16,056,300 |
| BD1 | 1.2 Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management | 1.3. Sustainable financing plans (1 strategy for terrestrial PA system, and 4 business plans for demonstration PAs) | GEF TF | 943,820 | 1,000,000 |
| | | Project Management | GEF TF | 283,577 | 840,000 |
| Total project costs | | | | 6,027,397 | 17,896,300 |

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

| Project Objective: Strengthen the terrestrial system of national protected areas for biodiversity conservation through enhanced representation, management effectiveness, monitoring, enforcement and financing | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--|------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Project Component | Grant Type | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Confirmed Co-financing (\$) |
| Component 1: Enhanced systemic, institutional and financial frameworks for PA expansion and management | TA | Improved institutional capacity of five units of the Forest Department for PA system planning and management indicated by a minimum 22% | Relevant policies relating to PA management and biodiversity conservation strengthened in consultation with government agencies and stakeholders (see SRF for expanded list of policy issues). Capacity of the Forest | GEF TF | 1,870,547 | 13,056,300 |

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>increase in adjusted score of the Capacity Development Scorecard</p> <p>Core operation of the national PA system in Myanmar covering 3,788,697 ha strengthened, leading to reduction of threats from forest loss, encroachment and poaching, indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A reduction in the annual rate of forest loss inside PAs to 0.5% compared to the baseline of 0.95% forest loss nationally. - Training for PA managers instituted with clear competency standards and individual performance monitoring system <p>The national PA system financing strategy is developed and operationalised, articulating PA financing needs and providing for concrete steps for meeting the financing needs. The national development plan integrates the PA system financing strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100% increase in budget allocated to the protected areas in real term compared to the baseline of US\$ 750,000 per year as indicated by the financial sustainability scorecard. Currently the only budget | <p>Department strengthened for effective management of the PA system, through: (i) establishment of PA management standards and PA and individual performance monitoring system for different categories of the PAs; (ii) institutionalisation of clear reporting structure and methods; (iii) establishment of law enforcement and habitat/biodiversity monitoring protocols; (iv) clear official guidelines for community engagement and co-management; (v) clear capacity development strategies and action plans for increasing management effectiveness of the PA system; (vi) incentive mechanisms for increasing motivation of field staff.; (vii) establishment and institutionalisation of PA data/information and knowledge management system enabling learning from and upscaling of pilot/individual project activities</p> <p>Training Programmes targeting PA managers institutionalised with focus within the NWCD. Certificate-level PA management modules established use of the Forest Dept and incorporated into their regular curricula for Yezin University of Forestry and Central Forestry Development Training Centers. At least 150 PA field staff trained and certified in conservation management and community outreach for PAs.</p> <p>A system-wide strategy for sustainable financing is developed for the expanded PA network. Economic case is supported through a series of economic studies for increased investment in the PA system, and financing sources are</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|----|--|---|--------|-----------|-----------|
| | | <p>sources are the national government allocation and occasional NGO/donor funding.</p> <p>Increased coverage of Myanmar's terrestrial PA network managed by the Forest Dept to 10% (6,765,530 ha) of the country's land-area from the current 5.6% (3,788,697 ha) with increased coverage of under-represented vegetation types and essential corridors. Ecoregion-type representativeness in the PA system Ecoregion (see SRF for details)</p> | <p>diversified including new sustainable financing systems. Based on the economic assessment studies, the project will develop procedural frameworks, mechanisms and policy recommendations for identified sustainable financing opportunities. It will particularly focus on Trust Fund, Ecotourism, PES (especially with hydropower) and Forest and Biodiversity Offset models.</p> <p>State/Region and local government units in Kachin State and Sagaing Region associated with the four demonstration sites recognize the value of PAs (in terms of ecosystem services and other potential income sources for local communities), and are able to incorporate these values into regional and local development and land-use planning.</p> <p>The National PA system expanded by 2,976,851 ha based on the national PA system gap analysis conducted for terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems and review of national PA network based on ecosystem and species representation, threats, system design and climate change adaptation. New Protected Areas in the critical areas gazetted.</p> | | | |
| Component 2: Strengthened management and threat reduction in the target PAs and buffer zones | TA | <p>Improved management effectiveness of individual PAs covering 2,604,000 ha indicated by the % increase in the METT assessment: Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary (1,737,300 ha), Hkakaborazi National Park (381,200 ha),</p> | <p>Management will be strengthened through development of business plans for the 4 PAs, integrated reporting across multi-year plans, and legal recognition of the management plans. Participatory results-based management will be introduced, and incorporated into the development and revision of site management plans. PA site operation is</p> | GEF TF | 3,873,273 | 4,000,000 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------|-----------|------------|
| | <p>Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary (270,400 ha) and Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary (215,100) – See SRF indicator 2.3 for baseline and target METT scores.</p> <p>Reduction of threats at the local level indicated by an eventual reduction in the number of individuals stopped inside the PA for illegal activities as shown in SMART monthly patrolling reports.</p> <p>Improved habitat conditions at local level indicated by percentage change in forest cover caused by encroachment in Core Areas of PAs measured through remote sensing three times during the project (see SRF Objective indicator 2 for baseline and target figures). -Stable or increased encounter rates for specified key species in each demonstration PA based on annual summaries of SMART patrolling data</p> | <p>strengthened to address existing threats to biodiversity, through: (i) strengthening of enforcement targeting illegal harvesting, poaching, mining, and encroachment through operationalisation of the SMART patrolling and law enforcement monitoring system; (ii) development and operationalisation of habitat and biological monitoring systems for key ecosystems and threatened species; (iii) clear park boundary demarcation for decreasing encroachment; (iv) staff training tailored to improve knowledge and skills of PA staff and local partners to manage specific threats to the PAs; (v) management infrastructure consolidation (signage, patrol camps, equipment etc).</p> <p>Pilot systems developed and implemented for community participation in PA management at the four PAs. These will pilot establishment of site stakeholder committees, training and education on climate change adaptation, development of community based resource management plans. Specific locally-based threats will be addressed through appropriate involvement processes, including awareness programmes, sustainable livelihoods and conservation agreements that reward improved practices.</p> | | | |
| | | Subtotal | | 5,743,820 | 17,056,300 |
| | | Project management Cost (PMC) ³ | GEF TF | 283,577 | 840,000 |
| | | Total project costs | | 6,027,397 | 17,896,300 |

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier (source) | Type of Cofinancing | Cofinancing Amount (\$) |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------|
| National Government | Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry | Cash | 4,646,300 |
| GEF Agency | UNDP | Cash | 12,000,000 |
| CSO | Wildlife Conservation Society | Cash | 1,250,000 |
| Total Co-financing | | | 17,896,300 |

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

| GEF Agency | Type of Trust Fund | Focal Area | Country Name/ Global | (in \$) | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | Grant Amount (a) | Agency Fee (b) ² | Total c=a+b |
| UNDP | GEF TF | Biodiversity | Myanmar | 6,027,397 | 572,603 | 6,600,000 |
| Total Grant Resources | | | | 6,027,397 | 572,603 | 6,600,000 |

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

| Component | Grant Amount (\$) | Cofinancing (\$) | Project Total (\$) |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| International Consultants | 524,124 | 355,240 | 879,364 |
| National/Local Consultants | 227,410 | 252,928 | 480,338 |

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No.

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: N/A

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The apportionment of GEF funds to Project Components 1 and 2 have been adjusted during the PPG phase in order to increase the planned activities at the four large demonstration sites, with the GEF budget for Component 1 reduced from \$2,247,397 (PIF stage) to \$1,870,547; and the GEF budget for Component 2 increased by the corresponding amount from \$3,500,000 to \$3,873,273. Thus the total of GEF funds allocated to the technical components remains unchanged.

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

There are some refinements in scope and emphasis for the following items in the project framework, as a result of more detailed analysis during the PPG. These changes will not affect the overall outcomes of the project:

- Targeted increase in coverage of ecoregions by the PA system has been updated according to the PA Gap analysis in the Project Document Annex 1.
- Reduction in rate of forest loss changed from 75% reduction to a reduction from national baseline of 0.95% to 0.5%. No local baselines available during PPG – these will be updated based on the official 2013 forest cover map due for publication in 2015.
- Strengthening of national policies under Output 1.1 has been expanded to include:
 - a) clarifying the legal status of PA buffer zones and rationalization of approaches toward them;
 - b) clarifying the governance arrangements for coastal PAs; and
 - c) enabling local people to use and benefit from sites within Protected Areas.
- Capacity building for strengthening of the PA system under Outputs 1.2 and 1.3 will focus on five units of the Forest Department as the responsible department within MOECAAF (not MOECAAF as a whole).
- A sustainable financing strategy will be developed under Output 1.4 for the whole PA system, rather than a national plan per se.
- Due to confirmation of the demonstration sites during PPG, Chin and Rakhine States have been omitted from Output 1.5 (as there are no demonstration sites in these States), through which it is intended that the State/Region and local government units in Kachin State and Sagaing Region associated with the four demonstration sites recognize the value of PAs (in terms of ecosystem services and other potential income sources for local communities), and are able to incorporate these values into regional and local development and land-use planning.
- In Output 2.1, site management will be strengthened through the development of business plans for the 4 PAs, integrated reporting across multi-year plans, and legal recognition of the management plans. Participatory results-based management involving local stakeholders will be introduced, and incorporated into the development and revision of site management plans. This has been revised from the original text as management plans exist or are under development for all the demonstration sites at present.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: N/A

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

In addition to the GEF financed initiatives described in the PIF, the project will also coordinate with the following initiatives:

The ADB/GEF GMS-FBP Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Programme (#4649) - Coordination with this initiative will occur through MOECAAF/NWCD, as it has strategic importance for strengthening the PA network through a biodiversity corridor in the south of the country.

The UNEP/GEF Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on Access to Genetic Resources and Sharing of Benefits (#3853) - Relevant to legal and policy issues in terms of regulating access to genetic resources in PAs, and providing benefits to communities. Has potential as a source of sustainable livelihoods for indigenous and local communities. This small national input to a regional Medium Sized Project is led by MOECAAF's Environmental Conservation Division. Coordination regarding sustainable livelihoods for indigenous and local communities living in and around PAs is proposed through this project's output on policy and regulatory review.

UNEP/GEF Adapting Community Forestry Landscapes and Associated Community Livelihoods to a Changing Climate, in Particular an Increase in the Frequency and Intensity of Extreme Weather Events (#5567) -While this project focuses on different demonstration areas, and is located primarily in production landscapes, its findings regarding community-

based adaptation measures could be very applicable to community livelihood / adaptation activities at the project demonstration sites. The project will therefore seek to share information through MOECAAF.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Information dissemination and consultation during the PPG

Project design was a participatory process, in line with UNDP's and GEF's requirements. The PPG phase included consultations with the project's key stakeholders at the national, subnational and local levels, including national level consultation meetings in January 2013 and March 2014. Stakeholder workshops were convened as follows for the demonstration sites (**Annex 7 of the Project Document**):

- a. For Htamanthi WS, the workshop was conducted on 11th September 2013 at the Homalin Town Sport Hall, Homalin. There were 61 participants from relevant District and Township level government departments, NGOs, representatives from villages in and around Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary. The Member of Parliament from Homalin Township and the Minister for Shan Ethic Affairs from Sagaing Regional Government participated in the opening ceremony.
- b. For Hkakaborazi NP and Hponkanrazi WS, the workshop was conducted on 18th September 2013 at the Environmental Education Center in the head office of Hkakaborazi National Park, Putao Township, Putao District, Kachin State. There were totally 64 participants from relevant District and Township level government department, NGOs, representatives from villages in and around Hkakaborazi National Park. The Chairman of Putao District participated in the opening ceremony.
- c. For Hukaung Valley WS, the workshop was conducted on 26th September 2013 at the Hukaung Town Hall, Tanai. There were 73 participants from heads and deputy heads from relevant Township level government departments from Tanai, Shinbweyan and Moegaung Townships, representatives from plantation companies and villages in and around Hukaung Valley WS. The Township Administrator of Tanai Township participated in the opening ceremony.

Approach to stakeholder participation

The project's approach to stakeholder involvement and participation is premised on the principles outlined in the table below:

Table describing stakeholder participation principles

| Principle | Stakeholder participation will: |
|--------------------------|---|
| Value Adding | Be an essential means of adding value to the project |
| Inclusivity | Include all relevant stakeholders |
| Accessibility | Be accessible and promote involvement in decision-making process |
| Transparency | Be based on transparency and fair access to information; main provisions of the project's plans and results will be published in local mass-media |
| Fairness | Ensure that all stakeholders are treated with respect in a fair and unbiased way |
| Accountability | Be based on a commitment to accountability by all stakeholders |
| Constructive | Seek to manage conflict positively and to promote the public interest |
| Redress | Seek to redress inequity and injustice |
| Capacity building | Seek to develop the capacity of all stakeholders |
| Needs Based | Be based on the perceived and real needs of all stakeholders |
| Flexible | Be flexibly designed and implemented |
| Rational and Coordinated | Be rationally planned and coordinated, and not on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis |
| Excellence | Be subject to on-going reflection and improvement |

The project will focus stakeholder engagement at the following levels of intervention: (i) working with national, provincial and local public institutions and agencies in order to strengthen their capacity to consolidate, expand and

effectively manage the PA System and to align project activities with the government’s strategic priorities; (ii) engaging with sub-national government agencies responsible for land use and development planning for the landscapes and wider regions encompassing the demonstration PAs; and (iii) working directly with PA staff, civil society organisations, formal and informal resource users (rights holders), private landowners and individuals to strengthen collaborative relationships for participatory PA management at the demonstration sites, mitigate impacts of sectoral practices, and optimise the socio-economic benefits arising from project activities.

Stakeholder involvement plan

During the project preparation stage, a preliminary stakeholder analysis was undertaken in order to identify key stakeholders, assess their interests in the project and define their roles and responsibilities in project implementation. This included the collection of baseline socio-economic information on communities, land uses and threats for each of the demonstration PAs, informing local stakeholders about the project’s planned activities and confirming their interest to participate in the project (see **Annex 7 of the Project Document**). A full Stakeholder Involvement Plan remains to be prepared upon project inception. **Table 3** in the Stakeholder Analysis section of the Situation Analysis in the Project Document describes the major categories of stakeholders identified, and their roles envisaged in the project.

The project proposes a mechanism to achieve broad-based stakeholder involvement in the project preparation and implementation processes. Stakeholder participation will include the following components (see the table below):

- Project Board (PB)
- Technical Advisory Group on Protected Areas (TAGPA)
- Stakeholder Committees at site level

Table indicating suggested members of PB, PPCC and Local Stakeholder Committees:

| Project Board (PB) | Technical Advisory Group on Protected Areas | Stakeholder Committees (for demonstration PAs) |
|---|---|--|
| Chair: Director General of the Forest Department; UNDP Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development; Ministry of Finance; Kachin State and Sagaing Division Governments (General Administration Departments / Forest Departments); and Wildlife Conservation Society. Other organizations may be added as necessary and agreed by the project executing partners. Director of NWCD will serve as secretary for the PB. | Representatives from MOECAAF (including FD), other relevant government agencies, research and educational organizations, NGOs (including WCS), technical experts and other relevant stakeholders to be agreed by the PB. Technical experts may be invited in to discuss specific issues. | Local Government (District and Township); Project contracted staff; Local community leaders; Private sector organizations and businesses; Invited experts as needed. |

Long-term stakeholder participation

The project will provide the following opportunities for long-term participation of all stakeholders, with a special emphasis on the active participation of local communities, and enhancement of inter-sectoral coordination for the PA system as part of sustainable development processes:

Decision-making – through the establishment of the Project Board. The establishment of the structure will follow a participatory and transparent process involving the confirmation of all key project stakeholders; conducting one-to-one consultations with all stakeholders; development of Terms of Reference and ground-rules; inception meeting to agree on the constitution of the PB.

Capacity building – at systemic, institutional and individual levels – is one of the key strategic interventions of the project and will target all stakeholders that have the potential to be involved in brokering, implementing and/or monitoring management agreements related to activities in and around the PAs. The project will target especially organizations operating at the community level to enable them to actively participate in developing and implementing management agreements. Women and indigenous / ethnic minority groups will be proactively considered for capacity building activities based on specific needs assessments.

Communication - will include the participatory development of an integrated communication strategy. The communication strategy will be based on the following key principles:

- providing information to all stakeholders;
- promoting dialogue between all stakeholders;
- promoting access to information.

The project's design incorporates several features to ensure on-going and effective stakeholder participation in the project's implementation. The mechanisms to facilitate involvement and active participation of different stakeholder in project implementation will comprise a number of different components:

i) Project inception workshop

273. The project will be launched by a multi-stakeholder workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity to provide all stakeholders with the most updated information on the project, refine and confirm the work plan, and will establish a basis for further consultation as the project's implementation commences.

ii) Constitution of the Project Board (PB)

The PB will be constituted to ensure consistent representation of the key stakeholders throughout the project's implementation. The representation, and broad terms of reference, of the PB are described in the **Management Arrangements in Part III** of the Project Document.

iii) Establishment of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU)

WCS will take direct operational responsibility for facilitating stakeholder involvement and ensuring increased local ownership of the project and its results. The PCU will be located in the NWCD and new WCS office in Naypyitaw, with a landscape conservation support unit in Myitkina (Kachin State) supporting site offices in PutaO, Tanai and Homalin to ensure coordination among key stakeholder organizations at the sub-national and local levels during the project period.

iv) Establishment of local working groups

At the activity level, local or specialist working groups (e.g., legal and policy review team, capacity development team, sustainable financing team, database and monitoring team, PA system strategy and action plan development team, community involvement team) will be established as required, to facilitate the active participation of affected institutions, organisations and individuals in the implementation of the respective project activities. Different stakeholder groups may take the lead in each of the working groups, depending on their respective mandates. There will be equitable representation of women and ethnic minorities on site stakeholder committees and groups related to community co-management, alternative livelihoods and awareness activities.

v) Project communications

The project will develop, implement and annually update a communications strategy to ensure that all stakeholders are informed on an on-going basis about: the project's objectives; the project's activities; overall project progress; and the opportunities for stakeholders' involvement in various aspects of the project's implementation.

vi) Implementation arrangements

A number of project activities have specifically been designed to directly involve local stakeholders in the implementation of, and benefit from, these activities. These include: the creation or development of new opportunities for sustainable livelihood options and natural resource uses for local communities, stemming from feasibility

assessment studies and co-management models. Women and indigenous / minority groups will be proactively considered for participation in sustainable livelihood activities based on these assessments. The principle of free prior and informed consent (FPIC) will be applied to the establishment of any conservation management agreements established with local communities, in line with the project’s approach to environmental and social risk management (see ESSP in **Annex 11 of the Project Document**).

vii) Formalizing cooperative governance structures

The project will actively seek to formalize cooperative governance structures at the level of PAs or their sub-units, to ensure on-going participation of local stakeholders in the planning and management of selected demonstration PAs.

viii) Capacity building

All project activities are strategically focused on building capacity – at systemic, institutional and individual levels – of the key stakeholder groups to ensure sustainability of initial project investments. The project will also seek to raise public awareness of the value and importance of the ecosystem services and biodiversity secured through effective habitat conservation and rehabilitation.

Coordination with related initiatives

UNDP will ensure close collaboration and synergetic impact with a number of UNDP-led initiatives in the country, especially those offering opportunities to cofinance community livelihood development, climate change adaptation and poverty alleviation. The project will be fully integrated in the UNDP’s Country Programme in particular with the environment Programme and the community development and livelihood Programme, to make sure that the project and Programmes are mutually supportive. The project will work closely with UN-REDD Programme and its partners in strengthening the links between the national PA network, sustainable landscape management and REDD+ community-based activities, and will also explore increasing sustainable financing opportunities through the REDD+ mechanism.

Linkages and synergies will be sought through coordination with the GEF projects listed in the following table.

Table indicating coordination and collaboration with Related GEF Financed Initiatives

| GEF Financed Initiatives / Interventions | How collaboration with the project will be ensured |
|--|--|
| FAO/GEF Sustainable cropland and forest management in priority agro-ecosystems of Myanmar (#5123) Approved April 2013 | Improved institutional, policy and regulatory framework for SFM and improved cropland management, as well as improved practice on the ground to be established by the FAO/GEF supported project will have direct positive impact on this project. Implementation of the two projects in the same time frame would allow an integrated approach for land-use based climate change mitigation and adaptation. The Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation and MOECAF (Environmental Conservation Dept) are executing agencies, therefore MOECAF’s Steering Committee for International Projects would provide a mechanism for information sharing and coordination. Cross-representation on the Project Boards/Steering Committees for the two projects would provide more specific opportunity for coordination. |
| ADB/GEF GMS-FBP Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Programme (#4649) Approved Nov 2009 | This programme aims to increase investments and improve the management and climate resilience climate resilience of high priority forest biodiversity conservation landscapes including protected area systems of the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS), recognizing the pressures on these landscapes from development and climate change. No on-the-ground activities or investments are planned in Myanmar. Myanmar will however be invited to travel to other countries in the region through the regional support project to participate in regional assessments, data sharing, planning, capacity development and knowledge sharing activities. Coordination with this initiative will occur through MOECAF/NWCD, as it has strategic importance for strengthening the PA network through a biodiversity corridor in the south of the country. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>UNEP/GEF Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on Access to Genetic Resources and Sharing of Benefits (#3853)</p> <p>Approved March 2011</p> | <p>Relevant to legal and policy issues in terms of regulating access to genetic resources in PAs, and providing benefits to communities. Has potential as a source of sustainable livelihoods for indigenous and local communities. This small national input to a regional Medium Sized Project is led by MOECAF's Environmental Conservation Division. Coordination regarding sustainable livelihoods for indigenous and local communities living in and around PAs is proposed through this project's output on policy and regulatory review.</p> |
| <p>UNEP/GEF Adapting Community Forestry Landscapes and Associated Community Livelihoods to a Changing Climate, in Particular an Increase in the Frequency and Intensity of Extreme Weather Events (#5567)</p> <p>Approved Dec 2013</p> | <p>Executed by MOECAF/Environment Conservation Department (ECD), and Forest Department (FD), Ministry of Transport(MoT)/ Department of Meteorology and Hydrology (DMH). Aims to increase the resilience of Community Forestry and associated local community livelihoods to climate change-induced risks in the Central Dry Zone, Rakhine Coastal State and Ayeyarwaddy Region.</p> <p>While this project focuses on different demonstration areas, and is located primarily in production landscapes, its findings regarding community-based adaptation measures could be very applicable to community livelihood / adaptation activities at the project demonstration sites. The project will therefore seek to share information through MOECAF.</p> |

The project will also support the implementation of the MIKE Programme⁵ and the timely submission of standardised relevant law enforcement data to CITES, as well as working with the WCS project for PA management support. Furthermore, the Project will coordinate with the Global Tiger Initiative⁶, through directly contributing to the National Tiger Action Plan. The project will promote the objectives and recommendations of the National Tiger Recovery Plan and will work in both of Myanmar's designated Tiger Conservation Landscapes (TCLs).

The project will coordinate with other initiatives through NWCD and the project's TAGPA meetings, including programmes implemented by INGOs such as WWF and the Smithsonian Institute, and national NGOs such as BANCA and FREDIA. Relevant work includes the following:

- d. The Brahmaputra-Salween Landscape Conservation and Development Initiative (BSLCDI) is a collaborative effort of ICIMOD and the Governments of China, India, and Myanmar (Forest Dept). The aim is to engage local, national, and regional stakeholders in efforts toward improved management of this globally significant, biodiversity rich landscape. The Initiative will develop a framework for cooperation and common understanding on transboundary landscape issues which will provide a basis for an integrated and participatory approach for conservation, adaptation, and sustainable development, within the context of global climate change. The process will be based upon the development of an improved regional knowledge base, information and experience sharing, capacity building, and promotion of stakeholder consultation and community participation. Duration is May 2013 – December 2016.
- e. EU Biodiversity and Climate Change Project – administered through a small grants programme for local NGOs – this could potentially support NGO-led activities in the project demonstration areas;
- f. A tiger conservation programme managed by IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature, is being supported by EUR 20 million from the German government through the KfW Development Bank. The aim of the programme is to increase the number of tigers in the wild and improve the livelihoods of communities living in and close to their habitat. The five-year Integrated Tiger Habitat Conservation Programme will benefit NGOs and conservation authorities from selected tiger range countries which committed to doubling the number of tigers occurring within their territories by 2020. Eligible countries include Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Nepal and Viet Nam.
- g. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) and KfW Entwicklungsbank have signed a EUR 10 million agreement to protect biological diversity in the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) region. As

⁵ <http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/mike/index.php> ; <http://www.elephantconservation.org/programs/archive-of-projects/cites-mike-programme-in-myanmar/>

⁶ <http://globaltigerinitiative.org/>

part of the small grants programme, it will support rural communities and non-government organisations in and around the ASEAN Heritage Parks. The project will initially focus on two parks in Indonesia and four in Myanmar.

- h. Smithsonian Institute: development of a framework for monitoring biodiversity, including protocols, mechanisms and indicators;
- i. WWF: general complementarity of programme interests with this project, including capacity building for SMART LEM at central PA system level, capacity development for PA management and sustainable land use, development of indicators for PA management minimum standards, support for data gathering for spatial planning including ecosystem services. There is significant potential to extend the project's approach to other regions of Myanmar and to add to its resources (through associated financing);
- FFI: ecotourism development at Indawgi Lake, possibly models that could be shared with the project?
- j. FREDA: strong experience on community involvement initiatives in the Central Dry Zone and Ayeyawady Delta (not in the north of the country);
- k. BANCA: Interested in supporting development of new PAs such as potential extension of Hkakaborazi including the Malika watershed;
- l. Both the UNDP CO and NGOs involved in community participation, development and gender work, such as World Concern and local organizations, will be consulted as part of the project's community participation programme, and involved as appropriate. The very limited funds available for community livelihood and development work require the development of partnerships to achieve shared goals;
- m. In addition, significant international GIS mapping and remote sensing analysis research by the universities of Maryland, Queensland and Singapore will be taken into account by WCS during project implementation.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

Strengthening the PA system in Myanmar will have significant socio-economic benefits at both national and local levels. Nationally, it means safeguarding the highly unique natural heritage for the benefit of current and future generations and ensuring continued supply of ecosystem services for the people of Myanmar. It will also help prevent the enormous cost, both in terms of asset loss and human lives, of natural disasters including floods and landslides.

Only one environmental valuation study has been completed to date (Emerton and Yin Ming Aung, 2013), which estimated that the value of Myanmar's overall forest ecosystem services is over \$7 billion USD. Of this, income earned from forest utilisation accounts for less than 15% of the value estimated in this study. By far the largest share – 85%, or around \$6 billion USD – comes from forest ecosystem services such as forest carbon sequestration, watershed protection services, insect pollination, tourism, and mangrove protection of coastlines and fish nurseries. Investment in forest conservation is therefore expected to deliver significant net returns, estimated at around \$39 billion USD over the next twenty years, or a net present value of \$10 billion USD. The GEF investment will contribute to these national economic benefits by strengthening the management effectiveness of the PA system.

Effective management of Myanmar's PA network and expansion of the network from the current 5.6% to 10% of the country's land area (the government target) – to which this project will contribute significantly - would safeguard around 20% of Myanmar's forests. No assessments of the forest carbon value of the PA network are available, but Emerton and Yan Ming Aung (2013) estimate the value of forest carbon sequestration in Myanmar from forests and mangroves at \$890 million USD. Protection of the forest carbon in Myanmar's PA network would therefore make a very significant contribution to efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. The Union Government has developed a Myanmar REDD+ Roadmap (led by MOECA), which is expected to be financed by the Government of Norway through the UN-REDD programme. The Roadmap already identifies expanding the PA network to 10% of the country's land area and enhancing the management of PAs as necessary REDD+ strategies.

Forest watershed protection is key to ensure a sustainable hydropower sector. Current installed capacity in Myanmar is around 2,500 MW (WEF 2013), generating around 8.6 billion kWh and distributing around 6 billion kWh (MNPED 2012) – about three quarters of total electricity generation capacity in the country. The Ministry of Electric Power estimates the country’s hydropower potential to be more than 100,000 MW, and has identified almost a hundred potential sites for development, with an estimated capacity of just under 50,000 MW (ADB 2012). Almost all of these planned or existing schemes lie within, or immediately downstream of, forested areas, but there has been no assessment of the overlay with the PA network. Emerton and Yan Ming Aung (2013) estimate the value of watershed protection services to the hydropower industry in Myanmar at \$721 million USD. At the demonstration sites under this project, plans for a cascading system of hydropower projects on the M’Hka River downstream of Hkakaborazi NP presents an opportunity for developing PES/PWS as sources of sustainable financing for watershed protection and as a means of linking ecosystem services and PA management into developing planning at regional and national levels.

Under current law there is no legal basis for communities to directly benefit commercially from resources inside PAs that are found on their traditionally occupied lands. Consequently, through the Forest Department, the project will review national policy and legislation in order to enable communities to have a greater role in the management of natural forests and a clear mechanism to share in the economic benefits derived from the sustainable harvest of forest products, timber and, potentially, carbon and tourism revenues. At the demonstration sites, the project can pilot options through which local people could benefit financially from the management of areas allocated to them (eg ecotourism and use of NTFP).

Locally, the project will bring in socio-economic benefits to approximately 50,000 people in and around the four PAs. Communities will continue to be able to benefit from access to an improved forest resource base, including NTFP and tourism resources (see the PA profiles in Annex 6 for baseline information on current land uses). Safeguards will be put in place for continued access, through full participation of community members in the PA management operation, with legally agreed sustainable use regimes and monitoring mechanisms. In order to ensure socio-economic benefits and their sustainability, local level activities will be carried out with the participation of local stakeholders, with full consideration given to gender dimensions. Local stakeholders themselves will implement many local level activities. There are already a number of successful livelihood support activities in place in some PAs, which have been supported by NWCD and WCS. These include community nurseries for important forest products and cash crops to support local livelihoods, and the recruitment of community conservation volunteers in focal communities to aid in law enforcement and monitoring activities.

Through the effective protection of key landscapes, globally significant ecosystems and biodiversity, coupled with its increasing accessibility to international tourists, Myanmar’s attraction as an ecotourism destination will continue to increase, with real potential for substantially increasing tourism revenue and employment creation in and around its protected areas. At Hponkanrazi WS and other demonstration sites, the combination of dramatic scenery, including high mountains, forest and clearwater river systems and rich biodiversity offer ecotourism development opportunities, with the potential to benefit local communities.

During the baseline assessment of the demonstration sites during project preparation, women and girls were recognized as key natural resource users and managers, particularly for collection of water and fuel wood and farming. They were identified as key stakeholders who engaged in and benefited from capacity building and improved natural resources management. Women were heavily involved in income-generating activities, and played a critical role in sustaining communities afflicted by opium addiction. Following UN and GEF gender policies and strategies (see the ESSP in Annex 11), special attention will be placed on gender equity, and in particular to ensure full participation of women in consultations on integrated natural resource management and land-use planning processes in the demonstration PAs. Similar attention will also be placed on equity regarding ethnicity in all relevant project processes, given the diversity of ethnic groups resident in the demonstration PAs (see the PA profiles in Annex 6). Specific measures will be employed in the community participation activities, including at least 30% of community facilitators will be women, and at least 50% of CBO members, and development of activities will include contact with women's groups. National consultant inputs have been included to integrate and monitor gender and ethnic minority interests into project implementation.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project's approach of addressing PA system level barriers (including weak systematic and institutional capacity to plan and manage the expanded PA system, and insufficient management capacity and motivation at PA level to manage local threats and achieve conservation outcomes) is cost-effective in that it will have broad applicability at provincial and national levels, including impacts beyond the selected demonstration sites. As such, the project contributes directly towards larger national policy, regulatory, fiscal, data management and communications goals in support of biodiversity conservation and an effectively managed national PA system.

The project will specifically aim to strengthen the sustainable financing of Myanmar's PA system. It will support the development and operationalization of the national PA system financing strategy, which will account for existing and future needs for enhanced management effectiveness and system expansion. It is intended that this strategy will be integrated into the national development plan including national budget allocation. In addition, the project will investigate a range of alternative financing options in order to diversify income sources (including public-private partnerships, dedicated PA tourism fees, Payments for Environmental Services (PES), Biodiversity and Forest offset mechanisms, and Forest carbon – Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+)), and seek to remove barriers for their use in PA management.

At a technical level, the streamlining of progressive approaches throughout Myanmar's PA system for law enforcement, monitoring and information management will be a cost-effective investment in terms of project impact as well as MOECAAF's operations in the long term. The project's approaches in building support from across multiple sectors, stakeholders including local communities, and building capacity of the MOECAAF and key regional Forest Departments are expected to lead to cost-effective PA management that avoids duplication of work, reduces biodiversity degradation and loss of ecosystem services from incompatible development practices, and ensures the sharing of timely information and resources.

The total GEF investment of US\$6,027,397 for this project will leverage a minimum of US\$17.9 million in cofinancing, a ratio of 2.97, with additional associated financing inputs anticipated during project implementation. The overall GEF investment in strengthening management effectiveness for Myanmar's existing terrestrial PA system (3,788,697 ha) will average around US\$ 1.6 per hectare per year, a small fraction of the estimated value of the ecosystem services provided. Only one environmental valuation study has been completed to date (Emerton and Yin Ming Aung, 2013), focusing on Myanmar's overall forest ecosystem services rather than just the PA network. This estimated that the value of Myanmar's forest ecosystem services is over US\$7 billion, of which some 85%, or around US\$6 billion – comes from forest ecosystem services that maintain the productivity of other sectors, add value to their output, and help them to avoid costs, losses and damages. This includes, for example, forest carbon sequestration, watershed protection services, insect pollination, tourism, and mangrove protection of coastlines and fish nurseries. Investment in forest conservation is therefore expected to deliver significant net returns, estimated at around US\$39 billion over the next twenty years, or a net present value of US\$10 billion.

Finally, the recognition associated with involvement in an international project and receipt of GEF resources channeled through a UN implementing agency is a source of pride for national, regional and local project partners in Myanmar, which often facilitates the necessary political commitment to take difficult decisions on issues such as expanding the PA network, upgrading PA protection status, inter-agency coordination to reduce external pressures on PAs, the adoption of more environmentally friendly practices in related sectors, and concessions on land uses; a particularly cost-efficient

contribution to biodiversity conservation in Myanmar.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

MONITORING AND REPORTING

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Bangkok. The Strategic Results Framework in Section II Part I provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes: inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, and mid-term review and final evaluation. The following sections outline the principal components of the M&E Plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities (see the table below). The project's M&E Plan will be presented and finalized in the Project's Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

A Project Inception Workshop will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, as well as UNDP-GEF (HQs) as appropriate. A fundamental objective of the Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objective, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first Annual Work Plan (AWP) and annual and quarterly activity plans on the basis of the Strategic Results Framework. This will include reviewing the logframe (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the AWP with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project. A gap analysis on the implementation of the ABS framework should also be conducted during project inception to confirm the scope of the project intervention.

A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Project Manager based on the project's Annual Work Plan, activity plans and its indicators. Specific targets for the first year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at the Inception Workshop and included in the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

Measurement of impact indicators related to biodiversity conservation targets will occur according to the schedules defined in the Inception Workshop. Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the Implementing Partner, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.

Annual Monitoring will occur through the PB Meetings (PBM). This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to PBMs at least two times a year. The first such meeting will be held within the first six months of the start of full implementation.

The Project Manager in consultations with UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU will prepare a UNDP/GEF PIR during the months of June-August. In addition, the Project Manager, in consultation with UNDP-CO will prepare an Annual Review Report (ARR) by the end of January and submit it to PB members at least two weeks prior to the PBM for review and comments. The ARR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the PBM. The Project Manager will present the ARR (and if needed the PIR) to the PB, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the PBM participants. The Project Manager also informs the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the PIR/ARR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The PB has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the Inception Workshop, based on delivery rates, and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

The terminal PBM is held in the last month of project operations. The Project Manager is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the terminal PBM in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the PBM. The terminal meeting considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects.

UNDP Country Offices and UNDP-GEF RCU as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to project sites based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Any other member of the Project Board can also accompany.

Project Reporting

The Project Manager will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. A Project Inception Report will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed Annual Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. An Annual Review Report (ARR) shall be prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the Project Board. As minimum requirement, the ARR shall consist of the Atlas standard format for the Project Progress Report (PPR) covering the whole year with updated information for each element of the PPR as well as a summary of results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the project level. The ARR should consist of the following sections: (i) project risks and issues; (ii) project progress against pre-defined indicators and targets and (iii) outcome performance. The Project Implementation Review (PIR) is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. Once the project has been under implementation for a year (from the CEO approval date), a Project Implementation Report must be completed by the CO together with the project team. Quarterly progress reports: Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team. UNDP ATLAS Monitoring Reports: A Combined Delivery Report (CDR) summarizing all project expenditures, is mandatory and should be issued quarterly following the finalization of the quarterly progress reports. The following logs should be prepared: (i) The Issues Log is used to capture and track the status of all project issues throughout the implementation of the project. (ii) the Risk Log is maintained throughout the project to capture potential risks to the project and associated measures to manage risks; and (iii) the Lessons Learned Log is maintained throughout the project to capture insights and lessons based on good and bad experiences and behaviours. Project Terminal Report: During the last three months of the project the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. Periodic Thematic Reports: As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP-GEF or the Implementing Partner, the project team will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs.

External Evaluations

The project will be subjected to at least one independent external review and one evaluation: An independent Mid-Term Review will be undertaken at the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Furthermore, it will review and update the ESSP report. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The ToR for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal Project Board meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term review. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities. The ToR for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

Learning and Knowledge Sharing

The project will develop a communications strategy in the first year, which will be updated annually and implementation supported by a major subcontracted social marketing campaign in Component 1, plus three national education consultants for the project sites in Component 2. a communications, education and awareness specialist. This will include capturing and disseminating lessons learned, for review at PB meetings in order to inform the direction and management of the project, and shared with project stakeholders as appropriate. A project completion report will document the project’s achievements and lessons learned at the end of the project. Results from the project will also be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums.

Branding and Visibility

Full compliance is required with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the UNDP logo. These can be accessed at <http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml>. Full compliance is also required with the GEF Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the GEF logo. These can be accessed at http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP and GEF logos should be the same size. When both logs appear on a publication, the UNDP logo should be on the left top corner and the GEF logo on the right top corner. Further details are available from the UNDP-GEF team based in the region.

Audit Clause

Audits will be conducted according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable Audit policies.

Table showing M&E Activities, Responsibilities, Budget and Time Frame

| Type of M&E activity | Responsible Parties | Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i> | Time frame |
|---|--|--|--|
| Inception Workshop | Project Coordinator UNDP CO UNDP GEF | 10,000 | Within first two months of project start up |
| Inception Report | Project Team UNDP CO | None | Immediately following IW |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators | Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members | To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Indicative cost: 15,000. | Start, mid and end of project |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis) | Oversight by Project Manager Project team | To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost: 5,000 (annually); total: 25,000 | Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans |
| ARR and PIR | Project Team UNDP-CO | None | Annually |

| Type of M&E activity | Responsible Parties | Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i> | Time frame |
|--|--|--|--|
| | UNDP-GEF | | |
| Quarterly progress reports | Project team | None | Quarterly |
| CDRs | Project Manager | None | Quarterly |
| Issues Log | Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff | None | Quarterly |
| Risks Log | Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff | None | Quarterly |
| Lessons Learned Log | Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff | None | Quarterly |
| Mid-term Evaluation | Project team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) | 40,000 | At the mid-point of project implementation. |
| Final Evaluation | Project team, UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) | 40,000 | At the end of project implementation |
| Terminal Report | Project team UNDP-CO local consultant | 0 | At least one month before the end of the project |
| Lessons learned | Project team UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc) | 12,000 (average 3,000 per year) | Yearly |
| Audit | UNDP-CO Project team | 15,000 | Yearly |
| Visits to field sites | UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives | For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget | Yearly |
| TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i> | | US\$ 157,000 | |


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

| NAME | POSITION | MINISTRY | DATE (MM/dd/yyyy) |
|-----------------|--|--|-------------------|
| Hla Maung Thein | Deputy Director General, Environmental Conservation Department | Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry | September 7, 2012 |

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

| Agency Coordinator, Agency Name | Signature | Date (month/ day/year) | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
|--|---|------------------------------|--|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Adriana Dinu, UNDP- GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i. |  | 09/02/2014 | Midori Paxton Regional Technical Advisor – EBD UNDP | +66-81- 8787510 | midori.paxton @undp.org |

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|--------|--------|----------------------|-------|------|------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|------|---------------------------------|-------|------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|------------------------|-------|------|-----------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| <p>Objective:</p> <p>Strengthen the terrestrial system of national protected areas for biodiversity conservation through enhanced representation, management effectiveness, monitoring, enforcement and financing</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased coverage of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic PA network managed by the Forest Department to 10% (6,765,530 ha) of the country's land-area from the current 5.6% (3,788,697 ha) with increased coverage of under-represented ecoregions and essential corridors (see inset table) | <p>5.6% coverage (3,788,697 ha) of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. See inset table for baseline representation of ecoregions.</p> | <p>10% coverage (6,765,530 ha) of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, with increased coverage of under-represented ecoregions (see inset table)</p> | <p>Official Forest Department information; GIS/RS analysis</p> | <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Exploitation of wildlife and forest products driven by increased international trade and demand for land may severely impact conservation -Political tension between ethnic groups and central govt may limit ability to implement activities -Climate change may undermine conservation objectives of the project <p>Assumption:</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="352 561 926 678">Ecoregion</th> <th data-bbox="926 561 1077 678">Current % Protected</th> <th data-bbox="1077 561 1203 678">Target % Protected</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 678 926 727">Chin Hills-Arakan Yoma montane forest</td> <td data-bbox="926 678 1077 727">3.60%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 678 1203 727">3.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 727 926 792">Eastern Himalayan alpine shrub and meadow</td> <td data-bbox="926 727 1077 792">96.46%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 727 1203 792">96.46%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 792 926 857">Irrawaddy dry Forest</td> <td data-bbox="926 792 1077 857">0.45%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 792 1203 857">3.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 857 926 1011">Irrawaddy fresh water swamp forest</td> <td data-bbox="926 857 1077 1011">0.04%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 857 1203 1011">Potential to increase limited</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 1011 926 1068">Irrawaddy moist deciduous forest</td> <td data-bbox="926 1011 1077 1068">1.82%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 1011 1203 1068">3.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 1068 926 1125">Kayah-Karen montane rain forest</td> <td data-bbox="926 1068 1077 1125">0.60%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 1068 1203 1125">1.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 1125 926 1190">Mizoram-Manipur- Kachin Rain forest</td> <td data-bbox="926 1125 1077 1190">7.26%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 1125 1203 1190">7.26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 1190 926 1255">Myanmar Coast mangrove</td> <td data-bbox="926 1190 1077 1255">0.92%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 1190 1203 1255">3.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 1255 926 1404">Myanmar coastal rain forest</td> <td data-bbox="926 1255 1077 1404">0.69%</td> <td data-bbox="1077 1255 1203 1404">Potential to increase limited</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | | Ecoregion | Current % Protected | Target % Protected | Chin Hills-Arakan Yoma montane forest | 3.60% | 3.60% | Eastern Himalayan alpine shrub and meadow | 96.46% | 96.46% | Irrawaddy dry Forest | 0.45% | 3.0% | Irrawaddy fresh water swamp forest | 0.04% | Potential to increase limited | Irrawaddy moist deciduous forest | 1.82% | 3.0% | Kayah-Karen montane rain forest | 0.60% | 1.5% | Mizoram-Manipur- Kachin Rain forest | 7.26% | 7.26% | Myanmar Coast mangrove | 0.92% | 3.0% | Myanmar coastal rain forest | 0.69% | Potential to increase limited |
| | Ecoregion | | | | | Current % Protected | Target % Protected | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Chin Hills-Arakan Yoma montane forest | | | | | 3.60% | 3.60% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Eastern Himalayan alpine shrub and meadow | | | | | 96.46% | 96.46% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Irrawaddy dry Forest | | | | | 0.45% | 3.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Irrawaddy fresh water swamp forest | | | | | 0.04% | Potential to increase limited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Irrawaddy moist deciduous forest | | | | | 1.82% | 3.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Kayah-Karen montane rain forest | | | | | 0.60% | 1.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mizoram-Manipur- Kachin Rain forest | | | | | 7.26% | 7.26% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Myanmar Coast mangrove | 0.92% | 3.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Myanmar coastal rain forest | 0.69% | Potential to increase limited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | | | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Northern Indochina subtropical forest | 0.90% | Potential to increase limited | | | | The Myanmar Government continues to be committed to the extension and improved management of the PA system in the face of other demands for land and resources. |
| | Northern Triangle subtropical forest | 35.56% | 35.56% | | | | |
| | Nujiang Langcang Gorge alpine conifer and mixed forest | 0.00% | 3.0% | | | | |
| | Tenasserim-south Thailand semi-evergreen rain forest | 5.16% | 25.00% | | | | |
| | Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests | 6.04% | 6.04% | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved habitat conditions at local level indicated by percentage change in forest cover caused by encroachment in Core Areas of PAs measured through remote sensing three times during the project. | | | See inset table for baseline annual rate of change in forest cover and encroachment by PA | See inset table for target annual rate of change in forest cover and encroachment by PA | Project reports based on three remote sensing assessments | |
| | Protected Area | Baseline forest cover⁷ (% change / year) | Target forest cover (% change / year) | | | | |
| | Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary | 0.95% | 0.5% | | | | |
| | Hkakaborazi National Park | 0.95% | 0.5% | | | | |
| | Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary | 0.95% | 0.5% | | | | |
| | Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary | 0.95% | 0.5% | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Sustainability of PA System (See Annex 3) | | | Baseline Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (October 2013) 15% | Target Financial Sustainability Scorecard score | Project reports on Financial Sustainability Scorecard | |

⁷Baseline rates of change in forest cover are not available for the four protected areas. The national average rate of 0.95% has therefore been used as a proxy, although local rates will vary. The baseline rates for the demonstration PAs will be updated based on the official 2013 forest cover map due for publication by 2015.

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 25% | | |
| Outcome 1: Enhanced systemic, institutional and financial frameworks for PA expansion and management | Outputs: Output 1.1: Strengthened national policies relating to PA management and biodiversity conservation Output 1.2: Capacity of the Forest Department strengthened for effective management of the PA system Output 1.3: Training Programmes targeting PA managers institutionalised within the Forest Department Output 1.4: A system-wide strategy for sustainable financing of the PA network is developed and piloted for the expanded PA system Output 1.5: Sub-national government units associated with the four demonstration PAs incorporate PA values into regional and local development Output 1.6: National PA system expanded based on gap analysis for terrestrial ecosystems and PA network review | | | | |
| | 1.1.Strengthened national policies and legislation address the following key issues for the PA system: a) enabling PAs to have access to funds raised through sustainable financing; b) integrating valuation of ecosystem services (ES) into national land use planning; c) clarifying the legal status of PA buffer zones and rationalization of approaches toward them; d) clarifying the governance arrangements for coastal PAs; and e) enabling local people to use and benefit from sites within Protected Areas. | a) PAs currently only access government funding; b) values of ES not considered in national land use planning; c) PA buffer zones vary in location and legal status; d) governance responsibilities for coastal PAs are complex and unclear; e) | a) PAs can access diverse sources of funding for management; b) national land use planning policy incorporates valuation of ES; c) PA buffer zones are given specific and consistent legal recognition; d) governance of coastal PAs is | Official MOECA reports and reports of related government agencies | Risks: -Exploitation of wildlife and forest products driven by increased international trade and demand for land may severely impact conservation -Political tension between ethnic groups and central govt may limit ability to |

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | local people have no legal use rights within PAs. | clarified in national policy and law; e) legislation passed to enable local use of land within PAs with appropriate safeguards. | | implement activities and access sources of funding -Climate change may undermine conservation objectives of the project |
| | 1.2.Improved institutional capacity of the Forest Department for the PA system planning and management as indicated by the Capacity Development Scorecard (see Annex 2)* *Combined average for NWCD, Sagaing region, Kachin state, the Training and Research Development Division and the Planning and Statistics Division | Capacity Development Scorecard baseline: 45% | Capacity Development Scorecard target: 67% | Project reports on Capacity Development Scorecard | Assumption: The Myanmar Government continues to be committed to the extension and improved management of the PA system in the face of other demands for land and resources. |
| | 1.3.Certificate-level PA management modules are established for the use of the Forest Department and incorporated into their regular curricula at Yezin University of Forestry and Central Forestry Development Training Centers as appropriate | No formal training courses on PA management are available in Myanmar | Certificate-level PA management modules are incorporated into regular curricula at Yezin UoF and CFDTCS. At least 150 FD field staff trained and certified in | Official Forest Dept. and Yezin University reports | |

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | Conservation Management and Community Outreach for PAs ⁸ . | | |
| | 1.4.100% increase in total budget allocated to the protected areas in real terms compared to the baseline as indicated by the financial sustainability scorecard (see Annex 3). | US\$ 750,000 ⁹ per year as indicated by the financial sustainability scorecard. | 100% increase in budget allocated to the protected areas in real terms compared to baseline as indicated by the financial sustainability scorecard. | | |
| Outcome 2. Strengthened | Outputs: Output 2.1: Strengthening management through business plans for the four demonstration PAs Output 2.2: Demonstration PA site operations strengthened to address existing threats to biodiversity | | | | |

⁸This would include SMART enforcement patrolling, biological monitoring of key ecosystems and threatened species, techniques for community-based conservation and environmental education at Central Forestry Development Training Centers. SMART (Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool) patrol system developed by WCS and partners globally is based on an established tool called Management Information System (or MIST). MIST allows rangers on field patrol to use handheld GPS devices to record geospatial and metadata information about encounters with poachers, snares, and other types of disturbance and encroachment in the protected area. Rangers also collect information about sightings or signs of key species they encounter. The field data is subsequently downloaded from the GPS device to a central computer where it is aggregated as a local and/or national level dataset. This compiled data gives protected-area managers and other conservation stakeholders an unparalleled 'big picture' view of where resources are most needed and where they can most effectively be deployed.

⁹Based on the exchange rate of 800 kyat = 1 US\$.

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--------------------------|----|--|--|----|----|----|----|----|-----------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------------------------------|---|----|----|----|---|---|------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|--|--|
| management and threat reduction in the target PAs and buffer zones | <p>Output 2.3: Pilot systems developed and implemented for community participation at the four demonstration PAs</p> <p>Output 2.4 Analysis of drivers and planning for forestry and wildlife law enforcement in Kachin State</p> <p>Output 2.5 Increased capacity for monitoring, assessing and reporting the impacts of improved PA management on ecosystems, key species, threats and local livelihoods</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>2.1.Reduction of threats at the local level indicated by an eventual reduction in the number of individuals stopped inside the PA for illegal activities as shown in SMART monthly patrolling reports. See Annex 9 for baseline.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="352 727 1203 1084"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Protected Area</th> <th rowspan="2">SMART Baseline*</th> <th colspan="5">SMART Target*</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Y1</th> <th>Y2</th> <th>Y3</th> <th>Y4</th> <th>Y5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary</td> <td>20</td> <td>30</td> <td>40</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hkakaborazi National Park</td> <td>20</td> <td>30</td> <td>40</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> <td>20</td> <td>15</td> <td>8</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary</td> <td>20</td> <td>30</td> <td>40</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Catch effort /100km patrol distance</p> | Protected Area | SMART Baseline* | SMART Target* | | | | | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Y5 | Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary | 20 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 10 | Hkakaborazi National Park | 20 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 10 | Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary | 0 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 8 | 5 | Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary | 20 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 10 | See inset table for baseline rate of individuals stopped per year for illegal activities for every 100km patrolled in each PA | See inset table for predicted annual target rates of individuals stopped per year for illegal activities for every 100km patrolled in each PA | SMART monthly patrolling reports for each PA | <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Exploitation of wildlife and forest products driven by increased international trade and demand for land may severely impact conservation -Political tension between ethnic groups and central govt may limit ability to implement activities |
| | Protected Area | | | SMART Baseline* | SMART Target* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y1 | | Y2 | Y3 | | Y4 | Y5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary | 20 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hkakaborazi National Park | 20 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary | 0 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 8 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary | 20 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>2.2.Stable or increased encounter rates for key indicator species in each demonstration PA based on annual summaries of SMART patrolling data and focused auditory surveys for gibbons.</p> | Encounter rate of 2 Hoolock Gibbon groups/ km ² for Hukaung valley WS, Hponkanrazi WS and | Encounter rate of 2 Hoolock Gibbon groups/ km ² and 2.5 ungulate sign observations/ 100 km patrolled | Annual analyses of SMART monthly patrolling reports and focused | <p>Assumption:</p> <p>Subnational government agencies are</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|------------|------------|---|------------|------------|--|------------|------------|---|------------|------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | Htamanthi WS. 2.5 ungulate sign observations/ 100 km patrolled for Htamanthi WS. Baselines for other sites to be completed during Year 1. | for all four demonstration sites | auditory surveys for each PA | committed to the extension and improved management of the PA system in the face of other demands for land and resources. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>2.3.Improved management effectiveness of individual PAs covering 2,604,000 ha, indicated by the % increase in the METT assessment (see Annex 3):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="352 699 1203 1130"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="352 699 768 792">Protected Area</th> <th data-bbox="768 699 995 792">METT Baseline Score</th> <th data-bbox="995 699 1203 792">METT Target Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 792 768 873">Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary (1,737,300 ha)</td> <td data-bbox="768 792 995 873">52%</td> <td data-bbox="995 792 1203 873">82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 873 768 954">Hkakaborazi National Park (381,200 ha)</td> <td data-bbox="768 873 995 954">51%</td> <td data-bbox="995 873 1203 954">83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 954 768 1036">Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary (270,400 ha)</td> <td data-bbox="768 954 995 1036">12%</td> <td data-bbox="995 954 1203 1036">69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="352 1036 768 1130">Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary (215,100)</td> <td data-bbox="768 1036 995 1130">49%</td> <td data-bbox="995 1036 1203 1130">82%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Protected Area | METT Baseline Score | METT Target Score | Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary (1,737,300 ha) | 52% | 82% | Hkakaborazi National Park (381,200 ha) | 51% | 83% | Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary (270,400 ha) | 12% | 69% | Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary (215,100) | 49% | 82% | See inset table for METT Baseline scores | See inset table for METT Target scores | Project reports on METT applied at PPG, midterm and project completion | |
| Protected Area | METT Baseline Score | METT Target Score | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary (1,737,300 ha) | 52% | 82% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hkakaborazi National Park (381,200 ha) | 51% | 83% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary (270,400 ha) | 12% | 69% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary (215,100) | 49% | 82% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2.4.Community participation systems piloted at demonstration PAs and incorporated into management plans | No existing systematic measures for community participation at demonstration PAs | Community participation systems piloted at demonstration PAs and incorporated into | Project reports evaluating pilot activities; revised site management plans | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Objective/ Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | management plans | | |

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

| Comments | Responses | Reference in Project Document |
|--|--|---|
| Responses to GEF Secretariat review at Work Programme inclusion – October 3, 2012 | | |
| <p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p> | <p>Yes. Refer to section B3 of the PIF. Further details on the participation of indigenous peoples are expected at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>The project management section of the main text and the Stakeholder Involvement Plan describe the project’s equitable and proactive approach towards the involvement of women and indigenous groups / ethnic minorities in project implementation.</p> <p>At the demonstration sites, WCS will appoint experienced staff to act as focal points for community engagement and development, and will assign and train community facilitators (CF) to lead the community participation (see Annex 10) and capacity development processes. Representation of ethnic minorities will be considered for CF positions in relation to the ethnic composition of the communities involved (which varies across the demonstration sites – see the PA profiles in Annex 6). The project will also strengthen the representation of stakeholders including local communities on committees supporting site management. There will be proactive consideration of the involvement of women and ethnic minorities on local level committees and groups related to project activities including community co-management, training, alternative livelihoods and awareness activities.</p> <p>Women and indigenous / minority groups will be proactively considered for participation in sustainable livelihood activities based on project assessments. The principle of free prior and informed consent (FPIC) will be applied to the establishment of any conservation management agreements established with local communities, in line with the project’s approach to environmental and social risk management (see ESSP in Annex 11).</p> <p>The presence of indigenous peoples at each of the four demonstration PAs is documented in Annex 6.</p> | <p>Section 1, Part III – project mgt sub- section; Section IV Part IV; Annexes 6, 10 & 11</p> |
| <p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p> | <p>Ratio of 3:1, in grant financing. This is accepted at PIF stage. Please make every effort to increase co-financing ratio during project preparation.</p> <p>See the cofinancing summary in the Budget (section III) and Cofinancing letters in Section IV Part I.</p> <p>The co-financing amount remains the same amount as indicated in the PIF. Project proponents have made efforts to secure additional cofinancing, however, they have not yet materialized. For instance, WCS has spoken extensively with the Government of Norway but their process is still on-going and they are unable to commit significant funds until 2015, if then. WCS is also in</p> | <p>Section III; Section IV Part I.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>discussion with ICI in Germany but they are not currently investing in Myanmar, therefore WCS is going through a regional grant with Cambodia and Indonesia, so this is still not at a stage where they would commit to co-financing. We will continue to mobilise additional co-financing throughout the project implementation period.</p> | |
| Responses to STAP review comments - Further guidance from STAP | | |
| <p>1.STAP welcomes the emphasis on strengthening the enabling environment and capacity development. The strengthening of policies that integrate the valuation of ecosystem services into national level land-use and economic planning is especially relevant. It would be most useful to elaborate further the approaches to be used in this key element of mainstreaming during project development. The fluid political developments in Myanmar offer unique opportunities to introduce new approaches into law as the country reviews its legislative framework.</p> | <p>The policy review process to be undertaken in Output 1.1 specifically includes: a) enabling policy that ensures PAs have clear access to funds raised through sustainable financing mechanisms (linked to Output 1.4); b) policies that integrate the valuation of ecosystem services with national level land-use planning.</p> <p>The project will also support a series of studies under Output 1.4 to inform policy review, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of the intersection between planned hydropower developments and protection of upstream watersheds by protected areas, in order to develop a business case for hydropower companies to pay for watershed protection. • An assessment of the forest carbon values of Myanmar’s protected area network. <p>Through Output 1.5, The project will support enhancement of awareness and knowledge on the part of State, Region and local government units in Kachin State and Sagaing Region, on the value of PAs in terms of ecosystem services (especially through PWS and REDD+) and other potential income sources for local communities, drawing on the economic studies in Output 1.4 and demonstration activities in Component 2. This output aims to catalyse local government support for the PA system so that they will be able to incorporate these values into regional and local development and fiscal planning.</p> | <p>Section I Part II – Outputs 1.1, 1.4 & 1.5; Annexes 4 & 8.</p> |

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁰

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

| <i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i> | <i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i> | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| | <i>Budgeted Amount</i> | <i>Amount Spent Todate</i> | <i>Amount Committed</i> |
| Policy framework and Institutional capacity review | 18,000.00 | 10,864.00 | 7,136.00 |
| Conservation needs assessment | 32,000.00 | 19,315.00 | 12,685.00 |
| Analysis of wildlife/forest crime and related low enforcement | 20,000.00 | 12,072.00 | 7,928.00 |
| Assessment of baseline PA financing and opportunities for sustainable financing mechanisms | 10,000.00 | 6,036.00 | 3,964.00 |
| Local stakeholder engagement, gender assessment, environmental and social safeguard screening | 15,000.00 | 9,053.00 | 5,947.00 |
| Feasibility analysis and budgeting | 5,457.00 | 3,294.00 | 2,163.00 |
| TOTAL | 100,457.00 | 60,634.00 | 39,823.00 |

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

¹⁰ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.