



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9131		
Country/Region:	Myanmar		
Project Title:	Reducing Climate Vulnerability of Coastal Communities of Myanmar through an Ecosystem-based Approach		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5101 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		CCA-3; CCA-2; CCA-1;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$7,031,010
Co-financing:	\$21,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,831,010
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Doley Tshering

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	FI, 7/23/15: Adjustment is requested. The project is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-2 (strengthening institutional and technical capacities for effective adaptation) and CCA-3 (mainstreaming adaptation in development frameworks). However, objective CCA-1 is also relevant to the project, through Table B's Output	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2.1.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please adjust Table A to also include CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability of people, livelihoods and natural systems to adverse effects of climate change).</p> <p>FI, 8/3/15: Yes. Table A now includes LDCF objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. Myanmar's NAPA identifies community-based mangrove restoration in degraded areas of the coastal Rakhine State -- a main thrust of this project -- as a priority. The project is also aligned with the country's National Sustainable Development Strategy, particularly Goal 8, which focuses on environmental sustainability and increased agricultural production.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>FI, 6/5/2015: Further information is requested. The PIF discusses factors contributing to mangrove degradation in Myanmar's coastal areas, and the high vulnerability of coastal communities to anticipated adverse impacts of climatic variability and change</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(including sea level rise). The proposed measures are innovative in Myanmar's context, and seek to both mainstream climate change adaptation in policy frameworks as well as build on-the-ground resilience of coastal communities to climate change impacts.</p> <p>Recommended action: The Agency is requested to provide information on the potential risk of lack of community uptake and sustained community support for mangrove protection and the mangrove-based livelihoods activities that the project will introduce (relative to other options, e.g., cutting down the mangroves).</p> <p>FI, 7/14/2015: Yes. This potential risk has been considered by the Agency, and a range of measures are expected to reduce the possibility of it arising. These include: adopting a highly participatory approach, raising awareness of the communities as well as their information/knowledge base on the dynamics of coastal risks and vulnerability, engaging communities in the collection of data and results, ensuring that their livelihoods needs are being met, and minimizing social</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		exclusion.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes. The project activities have been conceptualized with a view to integrating climate change adaptation benefits within baseline activities in forestry or coastal livelihoods where these are perceived to be missing. These include selection of climate-resilient species (tree, crop), adjustments to planting and tending practices, and diversification. The early warning system component of the LDCF project will build on a project under the Ministry of Transport that is installing radar services in a township in Rakhine State.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes. This project seeks to build resilience of coastal communities in four townships of Rakhine State, residing along 12km of coastline (approx. 100,000 residents). It will have the following 3 components:  (i) Strengthening decision-making tools for planning, enforcement and management: This component focuses on limiting the vulnerability of communities and coastal ecosystems that may arise from infrastructure and productive/extractive activities. This will be done through EBA measures, strategic risk assessments, integrated	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>coastal area management plans, generation of GIS-based information to support climate-resilient decision-making, regulations, a cross-sectoral institutional platform, training and information sharing;</p> <p>(ii) Enhancing ecosystem integrity and functionality: This component includes measures to improve connectivity of critical mangrove ecosystems, protection measures for mangroves, and management practices.</p> <p>(iii) Enhancing community preparedness through early warning systems: This component will develop information dissemination systems (e.g., community radio), including of agro-meteorological and EWS information to vulnerable stakeholders. It will also better prepare communities to cope with climatic hazards that are expected to increase with climate change (e.g., by 'flood-proofing' agricultural plots and developing community water infrastructure). It will also support knowledge management measures.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs	Yes for PIF stage. The project will apply a gender-sensitivity lens at every stage of project design,	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	considered?	<p>planning, implementation and M&amp;E. Participation and voice from women and marginalized groups will be sought.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please also discuss whether the project areas span marginalized or minority groups, and how their particular needs will be met by the project. Please also provide details on the efforts that have been made and will continue to be made to ensure that gender-equality related goals are being met by the project.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>FI, 6/5/2015: Not yet. Please address the comments for items provided for Item 1 and 3, above.</p> <p>FI, 8/3/2015: Yes, the PIF is recommended for LDCF pipeline entry. However, it will</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>not be processed for Council review and approval until adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>Note: While developing this project, the Agency is requested to: (i) explore options for potential synergy with current and evolving GEF6 GEFTF programming in Myanmar; and (ii) consider how the activities could be scaled up/replicated in other vulnerable states of Myanmar.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: (i) Please address comment provided for Item 6. (ii) Please provide further information on potential for scale-up and/or replication of project activities in other vulnerable parts of the country; and (iii) Please discuss synergy with GEF6 GEF TF programming in the country.</p> <p>Update, Oct. 25, 2017: Yes. An updated PIF, including an annex summarizing the specific aspects that required updating, was submitted and cleared. The Program Manager thus recommends the updated PIF for CEO approval given</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		that resources available in the LDCF are sufficient to process the project for funding approval.	
Review Date	Review	June 05, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 14, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 03, 2015	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		