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

GEF ID:	**9261**		
Country/Region:	**Myanmar**		
Project Title:	**My-Coast: Ecosystem-Based Conservation of Myanmar's Southern Coastal Zone**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-3 Program 6; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,046,347**
Co-financing:	**$15,650,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$18,696,347**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**November 01, 2017**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Fareeha Iqbal**	Agency Contact Person:	**Lan Thi Bui**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	FI, 8/14/15: Adjustment is requested. The PIF is aligned with BD 3 (Program 6; R2R), BD 4 (Program 9), CC2 (Program 4), SFM1 (Outcome 1) and SFM 3 (Outcome 5). However, it may have been too generous in its estimation of alignment with eleven Aichi Targets. Please state the most relevant ones. For example, Aichi Target 2 had been	1/8/2016: Aichi Target Clarification: It is recognized that the current list of relevant Aichi Targets remains broad. This reflects the project's geographic and programmatic scale. The total number has been reduced upon GEF-SEC comments. More precise contributions will be fully refined during the PPG stage. Please see Section 6 of the revised PIF.

[1] 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
		identified, yet the project's impact on poverty reduction strategies is unclear. FI, 2/8/2016: Updated comment to be provided after other aspects of the project have been discussed and clarified. FI, 4/7/2016: Cleared.	March 25, 2016 Clarified during discussion with GEF on March 22, 2016. No additional changes required at this time. However, FAO notes that further refinement shall be considered during PPG based upon more complete analysis.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	FI, 8/14/15: Further information requested. It is consistent with Myanmar's NBSAP priorities. There is insufficient information on how it aligns with national climate change mitigation and SFM related strategies and plans. FI, 2/8/2016: Information provided is not sufficient. FI, 4/7/2016: Yes, the requested information has been provided.	1/8/2016: Alignment with SFM and CCM Priorities: The project aligns with the Myanmar's national SFM and CCM priorities, e.g., the National Forest Management Strategy, 30-Year Forest Management Master Plan, and the drafted REDD+ strategy. Please see Section 6 of the revised PIF for details. March 25, 2016 Noted. Please note alterations made including additional information inserted in revised PIF Section 6 per GEF recommendations. This includes information from Myanmar's recently completed INDC. One of the few policy priorities specified in the INDC states: "Developing a coastal zone management plan to effectively conserve terrestrial and under water

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			resources including mangrove forests."
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Drivers of degradation: Adequately discussed. Myanmar's coastal fisheries are under strain due to over-exploitation, habitat degradation, and adverse effects of climate change. Its coral reefs and their biomass are in decline. Development along coastal areas, while fueling economic growth in the short term, is rapid and unsustainable, and devoid of accompanying coastal zone conservation and planning measures. Based on the additional information requested in this review (integration across focal areas, alignment with related projects, effort to address drivers of degradation), please provide more comprehensive insights on: Sustainability: Scaling: Innovation: FI, 2/8/2016: Other aspects of the project need to be clarified before information on these	1/8/2016: Innovation, Sustainability, and Scaling-Up: Additional information was added. This reflects discussions with BOBLME regarding opportunities to facilitate innovation, upscale and sustainability of coastal zone conservation strategies across the region. Please see Section 1.6 of the revised PIF. March 25, 2016 Revisions made according to clarification discussion with GEF on March 22, 2016. Further refinement will be completed during PPG.

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		aspects can be assessed. FI, 4/7/2016: Please see comment for Item 5, below. Comment for this section will be updated during review of the resubmission. FI, 8/5/2016: Yes for PIF stage. However, further information on how innovativeness, sustainability and upscaling will be achieved is requested by CEO Endorsement stage. Innovativeness: Yes, this is the first time that any coastal region of Myanmar will be developing and implementing an integrated ecosystem-based coastal zone conservation and management strategy, that will also yield concrete BD and CCM benefits. Sustainability: Yes. The project will help guide sustainable environmental planning in the coastal zone, as well as build the requisite institutional and technical skills needed to enable this. [Please also discuss at CEO Endorsement stage whether engagement with communities will contribute to sustainability, and how.]	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Upscaling: Yes. In being aligned with programs and frameworks of the BOBLME, working with community stakeholders to capture lessons, and piloting the development of a coastal zone management strategy, the project has the potential to be able to scale up best practices to other parts of the Bay of Bengal.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	FI, 4/7/2016: Please see comment for Item 5, below. Comment for this section will be updated during review of the resubmission. FI, 8/5/2016: Yes. All proposed activities are additional to baseline actions, and will generate biodiversity benefits (by helping to conserve globally significant species and management of conservation areas) and CCM benefits (through improved management of mangroves, seagrasses and other coastal resources, sequestering 3.8mtCO2e). The project also provides catalytic investment needed to support a more strategic and resilient approach to integrated coastal zone management in Myanmar.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate	FI, 8/14/15: Please provide further information on	1/8/2016: 1) tCO2e estimates

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	the following: 1) The methodology applied to arrive at the 3.8 million tCO2e figure in Table F. 2) Is this project in line with and will be implementing the activities agreed under the FAO-GEF Bay of Bengal LME SAP? 3) How the project will coordinate with the recently-approved GEF Ridge-to-Reef project in Myanmar (in terms of geographic scope, target ecosystems, and project activity). Please also discuss coordination with related LDCF and SFM projects in Myanmar. 4) The relationship between the marine benefits and coastal mangroves (where the CCM benefits will accrue). At present this appears to be primarily a marine/fisheries project and is not particularly integrated. Please discuss the tie-in across BD, SFM and CCM elements. 5) The outlook for sustainability of project outcomes and outputs vis-a-vis the current situation of unplanned economic growth along the coast. How will mining, industry and tourism related stakeholders be engaged? Also, how could oil exploration in the Tanintharyi offshore area potential impact the	The conservation of even a small portion of Tanintharyi's estimated 190,000 hectares of mangroves should deliver substantial CCM benefits. FAO's Ex-Act has been used to calculate carbon benefits. More precise benefits to be derived from project investment will be refined during the PPG. Please see Section 1.5 of the revised PIF. 2) FAO-GEF Bay of Bengal LME SAP The My-Coast project is designed to build upon and work in parallel with BOBLME. The BOBLME CTA and other stakeholders assisted extensively with the design of the My-Coast PIF. The project is fully in line with and supports activities agreed under the FAO-GEF Bay of Bengal LME Strategic Action Plan (2015) and current approaches proposed in the pending BOBLME PIF. Please see Section 5 of the revised PIF. 3) GEF Project Coordination My-Coast is designed to coordinate with all other GEF investments, (e.g., SFM/CSA project, Fish-Adapt, R2R, etc.). FAO/Myanmar is working with Government to use a programmatic

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		project? 6) How factors driving mangrove degradation will be addressed (e.g., mangrove clearing to develop shrimp ponds). FI, 2/8/2016: Further information is requested on relevance to CCM objectives, SFM aspects, and complementarity with UNDP's Ridge to Reef project. Specific comments on CCM benefit: a) To align with the GEF-6 CCM2, Program 4 strategy, the project components would need to address several aspects noted in pages 66-69 of the Programming Directions. These are limited to one or more of the following: Para 62. Support mitigation-focused management practices in LULUCF; Para 65. Support mitigation focused management practices in agriculture; Para 69. Support policies and financial mechanisms to maintain and enhance carbon stocks or reduce emissions from LULUCF and agriculture; Para 71. Establish and strengthen accounting and MRV in LULUCF and agriculture. Please clarify which of these the project is aiming to align with and where in the	approach to GEF-portfolio implementation. This includes the emplacement of coordination tools for all GEF projects pending and operational in Myanmar. The R2R and My-Coast investments are designed to be particularly well coordinated. PIF development included extensive discussions with government, UNDP (e.g., RTA), and associated NGO's (e.g., FFI and WCS.) The purpose of these efforts was to make certain the two projects are fully compatible and well coordinated. The two projects are in the same region (Tanintharyi). This is a vast and highly diverse area. R2R focuses upon improving protected area management effectiveness and coverage. The R2R will work within a small set of terrestrial and coastal zone protected areas. My-Coast sets out to improve conservation effectiveness along the extensive coastal zone, primarily targeting the productive sea/landscape. Please see Section 5 of the revised PIF. 4) Tie-in across BD, SFM and CCM The project is being designed to deliver a functional and informed coastal zone conservation strategy for the Tanintharyi

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		project components these aspects will be addressed. b) Please describe which of the following indicators will be included in the expected project outcomes/outputs in order to justify alignment with CCM2, Program 4: Indicator 4. Deployment of low GHG technologies and practices and/or Indicator 5. Degree of support for low GHG development in the policy, planning and regulatory framework. Please clarify where alignment with these indicators is included in the PIF. c) Please provide the inputs and outputs from application of the EX-ACT tool referenced in paragraph 57 in order to better understand the calculation of GHG emissions benefits. d) The restoration figures of 1,000-2,000 hectares seem rather small, especially given the generous commitments to reduce deforestation and degradation shown in Table on page 20. Please clarify what aspects of the project design gives confidence that the GEF intervention will have these significant benefits. e) References to the role for private sector partners, including land-	Division. The project's objective is to improve coastal zone management to deliver substantial multi-focal area benefits including the conservation of marine biodiversity, sustainable forest management, food security and climate change. Integrating and reflecting best practices related to coastal zone BD, SFM and CCM, the project develops improved strategy, planning, skills and support at local, national and regional levels (e.g. via improved regulatory frameworks, links to BOBLME, etc.). Local community members will demonstrate the benefits of strategic coastal zone conservation, particularly as this related to fisheries management and conservation of associated key habitats such as coral reefs, mangroves, and sea grass. Please see revised PIF Sections 1.3 and 1.4. 5) Sustainability and current unplanned economic growth The project's fundamental purpose is to catalyze environmental sustainability. As noted in the threats analysis, unplanned and poorly regulated economic growth are quickly emerging challenges. This includes the accelerated loss of biodiversity, forest (mangrove), and

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		holders, small scale fishers and farmers, are inadequate. For the project to deliver on its results, there must be business models developed that allow producers to have sustainable businesses under the new policies. Please expand description of how stakeholders from these businesses will be factored into the project design. FI, 4/7/2016: Further revision is requested: Agency is requested to remove the SFM funding request. While the project promotes a good landscape approach to coastal zone management that takes mangroves and other coastal ecosystem components into account, its primary focus is not on forest management. Unfortunately, with the GEF-6 remaining SFM resources severely constrained and heavily oversubscribed, pending or upcoming projects that have a much stronger forest-focus will be given priority for this very competitive SFM incentive. While mangrove conservation is an important and integral part of the proposed project, it is not the foremost, overriding consideration.	climate change mitigation benefits resulting from commercial aquaculture, mining, industrial development, oil exploration, and tourism. The integrated coastal zone conservation strategy will generate a vision for coastal zone conservation and development that is currently lacking. With the comprehensive and integrated approach, the project will help direct these activities towards a more sustainable scenario by setting in place an improved system for ecosystem-based coastal zone planning, management and monitoring. Oil and gas development is currently slated for far offshore. Coastal zone impacts will likely be the result of support infrastructure (e.g., Dawei deep sea-port). Please see revised PIF Section 1.6. 6) Addressing mangrove degradation Both Component 1 and Component 2 will address mangrove degradation. Conservation and restoration of mangrove habitats is a key element of Component 1 (Generate national capacity to develop and implement large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy). The identification, conservation, and monitoring of mangrove forests will be a principle

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Further, the SFM incentive has already been approved for 3 other GEF-6 projects in Myanmar that have a solid forest focus. In order to enable equitable access to the SFM incentive for all countries where this is needed, we are not in a position to approve further SFM access for Myanmar for GEF-6. FAO is encouraged to resubmit this as a MFA project with BD and CCM STAR finance. FI, 8/8/2016: Further adjustment is requested. Given that this project should be providing integrated benefits for mangrove and coastal management, yet continues to come across strongly as a fisheries project, we suggest including a sub-section on "Integrated benefits" in Section 1.5, where Agency is requested to summarize the cross-cutting landscape-level policy and investment benefits that will be provided through this project. FI, 9/12/2016: Cleared. Requested discussion has been included. Agency has clarified that Myanmar's fisheries sector has the potential to deliver global environmental benefits while also	aspect of the coastal zone conservation strategy and associated monitoring, capacity building, financing, and policy improvement activities. Under Component 2 (Enhance local capacity and demonstrate strategic coastal zone conservation management at the site level), the implementation of conservation actions to support protection of mangroves is specified. This will include designation of coastal zone conservation areas, mangrove rehabilitation, monitoring programs, etc. March 25, 2016: Revisions made to PIF per discussion with GEF on March 22, 2016. These issues and GEF concerns will be fully considered and further refined/addressed during PPG. CCM/SFM FIT: Please see generally PIF Section 1.5 (Global Environmental Benefits) for clarifications regarding CCM, SFM, integration and fit with GEF priorities. Including: a) align with the GEF-6 CCM2, Program 4 b) project support align with GEF-6 CCM-2 Program 4 Indicators 4 and 5. c) EX-Act tool information

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		delivering critical local benefits (through improved fisheries) that are crucial for stakeholder buy-in and to ensure that coastal development will occur in a strategic and inclusive manner that can continue to deliver multiple global environmental benefits.	d) Restoration target details PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: Please see generally PIF Section 2 for comment (e) private enterprise inclusion. COORDINATION: Please see generally PIF Section 6 (Coordination) for information pertaining to complementarity with UNDP's Ridge to Reef project. As noted in conversation with GEF: The timing/trajectory of the UNDP R2R and My-Coast are so far very much in tandem. Discussions are ongoing with UNDP team responsible for Project Document/CEO Request. UNDP team expects to complete this exercise in the coming months. It would be extremely beneficial if the My-Coast PPG process could commence as early as possible. This would greatly help to maintain our already well-established efforts to coordinate these two important and complementary efforts. 29 Aug 2016: A sub-section on "Integrated benefits" has been added as requested in section 1.5; see paragraphs 64-69. (As in previous drafts, Table F and paragraphs 47 and 63 are also relevant to this comment.) Those paragraphs and other smaller edits

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			in the document clarify that the project will provide broad ecological benefits beyond fisheries. The proposal also now clarifies that the proposed approach reflects the fact that people in the coastal zone generally view the locally relevant global environmental issues as fisheries issues. As the inserted paragraphs now explain, the long-term sustainability of coastal zone management depends on engaging, empowering, and benefitting local people, and to linking environmental concerns to their existing priorities. Finally, by framing some of the ICZM targets in terms of fisheries, the region's most vulnerable households (i.e., fishers) have a stronger voice in the process of coastal management. The project is oriented such that fishers are viewed not as inherent perpetrators of environmental degradation, but as important environmental stewards with closely vested interests in the health of coastal ecosystems. Emphasis has also been shifted in much of the rest of the document to broader ecological conservation, including in the logical framework.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes for PIF stage. By CEO endorsement: Please provide a clearer profile of the "10,000 households" that will be more	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		food secure as a result of this project. The PIF only mentions the Salon community, but their population is 2000-3000. Please also provide details on engagement (on activity design and implementation) with community groups (including women's groups).	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes, the proposed funding is within the FA STAR amounts remaining for Myanmar. As at 8/14/15, Myanmar's available STAR resources were $7.53 M for BD, $16.73 M for CC, and $1.79 M for LD. FI, 4/7/2016: Please see comment for Item 5, above, regarding unavailability of SFM resources. FI, 8/5/16: Yes. Funding request has been adjusted to exclude SFM.	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	FI, 8/14/15: Not yet. Please address comments for items 1, 2, 3 and 5, above. Considering that we have received number of PIFs related to forest and coastal management in Myanmar, the GEFSEC would like to have an upstream discussion with the OFP and his team on potential consolidation/integration, before moving forward with the individual PIFs. While the PIF states that the project will yield climate change adaptation benefits, please take into consideration, during activity selection and design, the potential risks that climate change can pose to the project. By CEO Endorsement: Address comment for item 6. FI, 2/8/2016: Some key aspects of this project are still not clearly articulated in the PIF. It continues to come across more as a community fisheries project and less of a mangrove conservation one. We would like to suggest an upstream discussion over the telephone to discuss the project more fully with the	MARCH 25, 2016 Conference call held on March 22, 2016 with GEF team. PIF revised with clarifications and additional information per-GEF comments/recommendations. All issues are now highlighted for special attention during PPG and final project document/CEO Request completion. Particular attention will be given during final project preparation to GEF's concerns regarding reference to GEF-6 programming directions/priorities for BD, SFM, and CCM investments. PPG efforts will include continuing discussions and strategizing sessions between My-Coast and UNDP R2R to maintain and expand established complementarity.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Agency, including a discussion on alignment with various focal areas. FI: 4/7/2016: Not as yet. Please see comment from 4/7/16 for Item 5, above. FI, 8/8/2016: Not yet. Agency is requested to kindly address comments for item 5, above. FI, 9/16/2016: Yes. Cleared.	
Review Date	Review	August 14, 2015	January 08, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 08, 2016	March 25, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 07, 2016	

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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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 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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] 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.