



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5159</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Myanmar</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Area Management in Myanmar</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5162 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,457</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,027,397</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$17,896,300</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$23,923,697</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>February 20, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>April 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Midori Paxton</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Letter dated 7 Sep 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes	

		country's BD STAR.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	BD-1	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes. Consistent with Myanmar's NBSAP (2012)	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. Sustainability is being addressed within the institutional framework and participatory approach piloted.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes. Current situation, the baseline project, and problems and threats are clearly described.	

	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes. Incremental GEF support will create an expanded and better managed PA network.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. Refer to table in section B2 of the PIF.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	Yes. Refer to section B3 of the PIF.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. Refer to section B3 of the PIF.  Further details on the participation of indigenous peoples are expected at CEO endorsement.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes. Refer to section B4 of the PIF.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?	Yes. UNDP partners with MOECAF and WCS.	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. <5%	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	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.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. UNDP contributes \$12 million grant financing.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			

Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	03 October 2012 UA:  Yes. This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	see #17 on the participation of indigenous people.  see #25 on co-financing.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 03, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	December 3, 2012 UA:  Yes. The PM has technically cleared the PPG for subsequent CEO approval. Please note that PPG approval is pending CEO clearance of the PIF.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 03, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.