

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: @@@@ @@, @@@@
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9261
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Myanmar
PROJECT TITLE:	My-Coast: Ecosystem-Based Conservation of Myanmar's Southern Coastal Zone
GEF AGENCIES:	FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation; and Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Irrigation

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the FAO proposal "My-Coast: Ecosystem-Based Conservation of Myanmar's Southern Coastal Zone". The project objective is to "improve coastal zone management to benefit marine biodiversity, climate-change mitigation, and food security". STAP believes the PIF is well developed scientifically and technically. STAP suggests the following to help strengthen the project:

1. One of the most important threats to Myanmar's fisheries is the overexploitation of the resources, primarily from international commercial fishing vessels. The PIF states that the maximum sustainable yield should be reduced to 0.1Mt/year, while it currently stands at 2 Mt/year. This project proposes to develop and implement a large-scale coastal zone conservation strategy, which we assume would address the legal/policy frameworks required to enable this significant reduction. Component 2 also addresses the issue of fisheries management, yet only seems to engage with small-scale fishers. While the proposed interventions are important in managing illegal fishing and further degradation of the resources, it does not address the larger issue outlined here. At this stage, it remains unclear how the project will effectively address the issue of commercial overfishing, in particular the awareness raising and enforcement of potentially new regulations arising from the coastal zone conservation strategy.
2. As the PIF correctly points out, there is currently a 'free-for-all' approach to exploitation of Myanmar's coastal resources. Artisanal fishers combine with commercial exploiters, while the agencies tasked with management are relatively ineffective. In such a situation, it is essential that a full stakeholder analysis be carried out using political economy/ecology principles. It will be insufficient simply to list stakeholders without understanding their power relationships and linkages. The PIF has a stakeholder table, but this is almost completely populated by state-run institutions. The stakeholder analysis being suggested by STAP will drill deeper into the communities and groups, including the role of men and women, actually involved in resource

exploitation and who will necessarily be part of any ICZM process for Myanmar. A useful starting point is the World Bank guidance on its anti-corruption pages -

<http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/stakeholderanalysis.htm> There are also a number of purpose-built tools to conduct stakeholder analysis – see for example, on the europa.eu website a Stakeholder Analysis Tool; this has an excellent ‘actor assessment matrix’ that includes the interests, resources and power-base of all stakeholders. A social science input here would be very relevant.

3. It appears there may have been a minor oversight in the Table under section B, Component 2, Potential Indicators, when listing the conservation of coral reefs as delivering CC benefits. We assume CC benefits refer to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, yet coral reefs are a source of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere through the calcification process (see for instance Suzuki et al., 2004, available here: <https://www.terrapub.co.jp/e-library/kawahata/pdf/229.pdf>).

4. Although the climate change mitigation measures relating to climate change risks presented on p.31 are commendable, more explicit considerations for climate change impacts will be necessary in the identification of conservation interventions, especially with respect to the habitat conservation efforts as presented under Component 2. For instance, while the mangrove forests of Myanmar are some of the least likely to be submerged due to climate change induced sea level rise by the end of the 21st century in the Indo-Pacific region (see Lovelock et al., 2015, available here:

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v526/n7574/full/nature15538.html?foxtrotcallback=true>), there are a number of threats to mangroves posed by climate change which should be taken into account in this project (see Feller et al., 2017, available here: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10750-017-3331-z>).

5. Up-scaling and replication is an important part of the proposal according to paragraph 61 of the PIF. STAP supports this but suggests that this is linked to a Knowledge Management Strategy for ICZM. As presently planned at paragraph 115, KM is somewhat vague and insubstantial. A good KM Strategy is essential. STAP has provided the GEF already with recommendations on this – see <http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to: (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to: (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.

