



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

GEF ID:	<b>6992</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Myanmar</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Ridge to Reef: Integrated Protected Area Land and Seascape Management in Tanintharyi</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5427 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,250,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$16,538,116</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$22,088,116</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 28, 2015</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 04, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Doley Tsehering</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	11/3/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared	12/20/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	11/3/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared	12/20/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	11/3/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared	12/20/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	11/3/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared	12/20/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	11/3/2014 UA: No. While the project is aligned with BD-1 Program 2, there are only weak link to LD and SFM objectives. As it is currently proposed, the project would not fully justify LD and SFM funding. Please refer for details under the design section.  03/04/2015 UA: The PIF has been adequately revised. The project design is now multi-focal.  Cleared	12/20/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	11/3/2014 UA: Project is consistent with the NBSAP only, no consistency with UNCCD plans have been mentioned. The link to UN-REDD plans is unclear.  03/04/2015 UA: Has been clarified in the resubmission.  Cleared	12/20/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to	11/3/2014 UA: Not fully. The distinction between baseline projects and GEF incremental	12/20/2016 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>value are unclear. The baseline as described is range of different conservation initiatives, however those activities do not form a coherent baseline and it is unclear whether part of the baseline activities are actually elements of the proposed project. For example, FFI's projects in the Myeik Archipelago and in Tanintharyi are listed as baseline but at the same time FFI is also an executing partner of the project. What will FFI be doing in the baseline and what, exactly, will FFI execute in the GEF project? The same question arises with regard to the Smithsonian Institution.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: Has been extensively clarified in the resubmission, supported by a overview in table format.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	Cleared
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>11/3/2014 UA: Not fully. The project is designed with a regional focus. It needs to be discussed on how the project will incorporate or contribute to national, system-wide work on the protected area system and/or SFM.</p> <p>The current design does not fully justify LD and SFM funding, which would need to bring an added value to the BD conservation focus of the project, for example, by a landscape level land-use planning in Tanintharyi using the HCV approach, working on sustainable land</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Not fully. Concerns raised by the reviewer at PIF stage on the outputs of Component 3 are still valid at CEO endorsement stage. The component needs to be brought fully in line with what was agreed at PIF stage:</p> <p>Expected outcomes agreed at PIF stage: i, §- Capacity building strategy for biodiversity knowledge generation and application integrated in the regional and national development framework and institutionalized in the government's human resource management strategy.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>use with communities, and on commodity sustainability standards (e.g. palm oil, rubber). The latter would also more directly address current major drivers of deforestation.</p> <p>Component 1: What exactly are the outputs? How will the project increase number of PES systems established? What offset mechanisms are envisaged? The PIF mentions that the focus will be to support generation of key biodiversity data and information. This should be part of the baseline and not funded by GEF. More important would be to emplace the management structure of the new PAs.</p> <p>Component 2: This should be the major focus of GEF investment. The most interesting activities for GEF are community participation in PA management including capacity building of local communities. Pilots should have a significant scale. Please provide further information on the location of Ngawun Reserved Forest. It is unclear what is meant by "up to four target sites will be selected". In areas that could be affected by the Dawei deep sea port, please provide more information on what this impact could be and how it will be mitigated.</p> <p>Component 3: Is all about capacity building, research, biodiversity assessments, scientific foundation and trial application of scientific knowledge, and co-operation with the Smithsonian</p>	<p>ï,§ - Increased institutional capacity to collect and analyze biodiversity information/data, and apply them to the conservation and management of PAs and KBAs, and land use planning, as indicated by the UNDP capacity development scorecard.</p> <p>The project document mentions: "A key result by the end of the project will be a book on the biodiversity of Tanintharyi based on analysis of the data collected". This is not eligible for GEF funding. Please clarify if GEF funding will be used to produce this book.</p> <p>It is also unclear how travel costs of \$367,000 are calculated for component 3.</p> <p>On component 2: It is well designed and should be the focus of the GEF investment.</p> <p>With regard to "at least 4 Sustainable Development Plans implemented for village clusters (c.80 villages) and USD 755,000 dispersed via small grants programme (at least 40% to female applicants)" please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- discrepancy between budget line 12 (\$555,000) and \$755,000</li> <li>- why only 40% female applicants?</li> </ul> <p>Please also justify travel budget for component 2.</p> <p>01/31/2017 UA: All comments have been adequately</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Institution (SI). Questions arise here concerning the eligibility of those proposed activities for GEF funding, in particular if the relation to the creation of GEBs in unclear.</p> <p>3/4/2015 UA &amp; YW:  1) Concerning PA system wide work, the national and system level approach to PA management is noted in the response matrix with contribution and linkages to the relevant national PA and land use/management policies, but we could not find relevant activities/outputs to enable these links in the project framework nor the text. Please clarify further.</p> <p>2) Concerning our comments to component 3, the importance of development and practical application of the national biodiversity information and data system for conservation has been further justified and recognized, but we did not find how this system will be sustainable in the long run, both financially and institutionally, and build in relevant project activities as needed. We also consider that a \$1.5 million investment is relatively high given our sustainability concerns and high in relation to the indicative co-funding and more importantly. Please clarify further and/or adjust the indicative funding.</p> <p>3) Please revisit the indicative funding allocation to the components one more time with a view of clearly focussing the</p>	<p>addressed in the resubmission and additional justification provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GEF investment being on component 2, in particular community participation in PA management including capacity building of local communities, and bringing this up to scale.</p> <p>3/17/2015 UA: Has been adequately addressed and PIF revised in the 2nd re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>11/3/2014 UA: Not fully. Biodiversity benefits are well described. The avoided emission figures need to be related to a reference scenario to make sense. LD focal area benefits are lacking.</p> <p>If the projects want to apply for SFM funding, a basic reference scenario needs to be developed at PIF stage. This would not only help carbon calculations but also clarify main drivers of deforestation and make the design more responsive to those.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: Has been addressed. LD GEBs are identified and for SFM, a GHG benefits estimation has been added to the PIF.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement</p>		<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>11/3/2014 UA: No. This is very generic and briefly described in the stakeholder table. Indigenous People (IP) issues are not discussed. Please note that Section A2 should have a focus on CSOs and IPs and elaborate on the issues, in particular given the context the project wants to work in.</p> <p>The PIF shows omissions in the discussion of local stakeholders' and local communities involvement in project preparation and design particular in the context that land issues, including land grabbing, re-settlement etc. are a major concern in this region.</p> <p>It is also unclear in the proposed design of who are actually the main beneficiaries of the project.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: The issue has been adequately addressed at PIF stage. Further details will be worked out during PPG and provided at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient	<p>11/3/2014 UA: Not fully. The risks related to Dawei deep sea port are missing. Also missing are risks from agribusiness expansion and</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>land concessions. Have oil palm and rubber plantations already encroached on the existing or proposed PAs? Is there any overlap in the concessions with those protected areas?</p> <p>The risk rating and mitigation measures for political tensions with ethnic groups are not convincing. Please provide relevant experience from other ongoing projects in Myanmar that the proposed cooperation with KNU will work out.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: Risk table has been revised in the resubmission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>11/3/2014 UA: Not fully. The Coordination with FFI baseline projects / executing is unclear. Please provide the "Joint Output and Impact Monitoring Framework" that is mentioned in the PIF. Please also explore linkages to the GEF-5 project in Thailand's Western Forest Complex, which UNDP recently took over. How will the proposed project link up with the ADB-led GMS Forest and Biodiversity Program?</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: Has been clarified in the resubmission and the links to be established will be conducive to project implementation.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Integrated land use planning is innovative.</p> <p>Sustainability and replication will have to be rephrased and better outlined once the design is adjusted.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: Has been rephrased.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Refer to comments at PIF stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>12/20/2016 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>The project's budget include \$960,000 travel costs and a vehicle for \$45,000.</p> <p>This comes to almost 20% of the GEF grant.</p> <p>Please reduce/justify.</p> <p>01/31/2017 UA: Has been addressed. Travel budget reduced by \$200,000.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-</p>	<p>11/3/2014 UA:</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>No. Appropriateness of GEF funding will need to be reviewed again based on a revised design proposal.</p> <p>Please also roughly indicate of how much GEF grant funding will be channeled through the executing partners, separated by partner and activity and outline the implementation arrangements in this context.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: Please refer to comments #7</p> <p>3/17/2015 UA: Has been addressed above in box #7.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>11/3/2014 UA: To be reviewed again based on revised proposal.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA: Yes, adequate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes, adequate. However, as most of the co-financing is in kind or parallel, it is even more important to use the GEF grant in the most cost-efficient way possible and so that beneficiaries have tangible benefits (see comments in box #15).</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>11/3/2014 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?</p>	<p>11/3/2014 UA: The request deviates from the norm. Please tick the PPG box in the template. Please adjust amount to maximum of \$150,000 for projects up to \$6 million.</p>	<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><u>At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</u></p>	<p>03/04/2015 UA: Has been adjusted.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>But clarification requested with regard to the EX-ACT carbon benefits estimates.</p> <p>03/24/2017 UA: Clarification provided in re-submission, including the EX-ACT tool.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		<p>12/20/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		<p>12/20/2016 UA: No.</p> <p>Please include in the Annex B of the CEO endorsement request template a response to Council members' comments</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>France and Germany.</p> <p>01/31/2017 UA:</p> <p>HAs been included in the resubmission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		<p>none received</p>
Secretariat Recommendation			
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p><b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>11/3/2014 UA: No. The project cannot be recommended in its current form. The proposed design of the project is not fully appropriate and not fully in line with LD and SFM objectives. Furthermore, the implementation arrangements with executing partners SI, GEGG, and FFI are unclear and appear to fragment the project in too many different fields of activities.</p> <p>The PIF would require major revisions to be considered for funding. The project proponents are invited to engage in upstream discussions with the PM.</p> <p>03/04/2015 UA &amp; YW: The resubmission addresses most issues raised in the GEFSEC review, however, some issues as listed above remain and need to be clarified further.</p> <p>03/17/2015 UA: The 2nd resubmission has adequately addressed outstanding issues. The Program Manager technically clears the project. It may be included into an</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		upcoming Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		12/20/2016 UA: No. Please address comments.  01/31/2017 UA: Clarification of carbon estimate requested.  03/24/2017 UA: Yes. Program Managers recommends CEO endorsement.
	First review*	November 03, 2014	December 20, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 04, 2015	January 31, 2017
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 17, 2015	March 24, 2017

\* **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.**