



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

GEF ID:	5123		
Country/Region:	Myanmar		
Project Title:	Sustainable Cropland and Forest Management in Priority Agro-ecosystems of Myanmar		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-5; CCM-5; CCM-5; LD-3; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,183,031
Co-financing:	\$13,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,683,031
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Franck Jesus	Agency Contact Person:	Jeffrey Griffin

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?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Yes. Myanmar ratified the UNFCCC on 13 Aug 2003. To date Myanmar has used none of its CC allocation	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Yes, in a letter dated Aug. 30, 2012.	
	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Yes	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Yes	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Resource Availability			
	• the STAR allocation?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Yes. Myanmar has used none of its GEF-5 allocation	
	• the focal area allocation?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Yes for CC (NR - UA) Yes for LD	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) & (NR - UA) For SFM/REDD+ incentive, the PIF adheres to the 1:3 ratio. However, please address comments below that deal with the general justification of SFM/REDD+ funding. 12/21/12 CCM Clear	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) No. See comments on disconnect between project focus and funding categories explained below in item 14. 12/21/12 CCM - clear	
	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?	9/19/12 (CCM-MB) Not fully. The document does not appear to be based on the recent UN Strategic Framework based on UN Country Team work. How does this project contribute to addressing the strategic priorities articulated in the Framework document? Also, while the Strategic Framework articulates climate change, the role and	

		<p>UNCT context (i.e., baseline) is not explained. Please describe this in detail.</p> <p>Myanmar has adopted Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration on environmental and development. The Forest Law of 1902 highlights forest reservation and protection, management of forest land, etc, and the establishment of forest industry and administrative action in respect of offences and penalties. The project is described as supporting CC mitigation priorities as expressed in the Initial National Communication to the UNFCCC and its priority measures to reduce GHG emissions in the agriculture and livestock sectors and the land use change and forestry sector.</p> <p>12/21/12 CCM - Thank you for addressing under B.6 and A2. Clear.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>9/20/12 (CCM-MB and FJ) No. The components are described generally and specifics are not given as to how the project will be framed and carried out. As a result the contribution of the components to sustainability of project outcomes are not clear. Please revise and clarify.</p> <p>12/21/12 CCM Thank you for clarification. For CEO endorsement please elaborate on development of M&E system and provide metrics to be used. Also at that stage please provide details on the long-term financing for SLM/SFM. Clear.</p>	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address.	9/20/12 (CCM-MB and FJ) No. There is little discussion on other related activities (eg. UN assessment on	

Project Design	<p>sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>and FAO projects on communities and the environment through community participation, mangrove restoration, Environmental Thematic working group, the existing REDD+ readiness program, contributions from Government of Norway) . Please clarify in the baseline, any activities are already developed or that would be developed without this GEF investment to restore or enhance carbon stocks or to monitor or establish monitoring systems for carbon stocks. Similarly, any activities involving climate adaptation (UNEP) or SFM or SLM. This will help clarify the incrementality of the proposed project in #13)</p> <p>Please provide a more comprehensive baseline description of CCM activity for agriculture.</p> <p>Please describe baseline land use and tenure rights? What is currently being done in country to which GEF incremental support could be provided?</p> <p>(NR - UA): The forest management baseline is not adequate. What is lacking is a critical analysis of the problems that the project is trying to address. In particular, what has caused the reduction of forest area and standing stock. What role does the FD and the logging industry play and how will these problems be addressed?</p> <p>12/21/12 CCM - For CEO endorsement please explain the UNREDD program under development and how it will be</p>	
----------------	------------------------------------	--	--

		during the project preparation stage. Cleared.	
	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?	<p>9/21/2012 (CCM-MB and FJ) The activities are not adequately based on incremental/additional cost reasoning. Please better describe the incremental benefits that will be provided with this project. As mentioned in #11 above, a better baseline description is needed to provide for incremental/additional reasoning.</p> <p>Please explain the method of C calculation, and (since Climate Smart Agriculture is proposed) CH4 and N2O. Also, please provide a better explanation of the source of values used in the forest C calculations. If improved C stocks are used as justification, please calculate the values without GEF investment then again what will be the results with GEF investment.</p> <p>There needs to be a more balanced funding contribution between LD and CCM regarding climate smart agriculture in Component 2.</p> <p>Dec 20 2012 CCM Thank you for the clarification.</p>	

		<p>express the carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in CO2 equivalents. Examples can be found on pg. 22 of the LULUCF publication at this website: http://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/land-use-land-use-change-and-forestry-lulucf-activities</p> <p>Also at the CEO endorsement stage please clearly detail how they will account for impacts on methane and nitrous oxide emissions in agricultural component.</p> <p>Clear.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>9/21/2012 (CCM-MB) The expected outcomes for CCM-5 are not phrased properly in the focal area strategy framework (Table A). Please revise. Also, please provide details on the indicators and expected outputs (ha and t C) and provide sources of figures used to calculate avoided emissions (in an annex will be fine).</p> <p>(NR - UA): As currently presented, the PIF requests major CCM and REDD+ funding but has a focus on sustainable cropland management. While GEF is interested in a SFM/REDD+ project in Myanmar, the PIF would have to be revised in a way that it clearly contributes to GEF's SFM/REDD+ objectives, based on a credible and critical analysis of the barriers to SFM.</p> <p>In addition, the following points are unclear:</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How will Government budget be increased? - Why is an approach focusing on smallholder farming and forestry stakeholders considered appropriate? <p>How will this approach affect 13 million ha of production forest?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.1.2 is an enabling activity (LD-4) and cannot be funded from STAR resources - Output 1.1.6 does not directly contribute to the objective <p>12/21/12 CCM C benefits on spreadsheet should be expressed in terms of CO2 eq as giving in text of B2. Please revise for CEO endorsement. Examples of calculations are provided in LULUCF brochure pg. 22, available at http://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/land-use-land-use-change-and-forestry-lulucf-activities</p> <p>Clear.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>9/24/2012 (CCM-MB and FJ)</p> <p>Because the baseline is not adequately addressed the incremental/additional benefits cannot be evaluated fully. Please revise.</p> <p>This section is very generally written. Please revise to provide more specifics and explain how the project will provide incremental benefits. Also, there is a need to provide the source of the values used and show the calculations for the global benefits. This can be included in an annex.</p>	

		<p>conduct forest surveys and inventories, how data will be assured, and how the inventories will be used for participatory management.</p> <p>12/21/12 CCM For CEO endorsement please provide details including metrics for forest surveys and inventories and explain how data will be managed and stored.</p> <p>Clear.</p>	
	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?	<p>9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) The description is quite general. Please include more specifics about how benefits will be delivered.</p> <p>The project is described as "gender neutral but experience shows that women are active participants in the pilot.." but then that "the roles of men and women will be distinct". Please elaborate on how the active participation of women will be fostered.</p> <p>Please discuss how the project will support the achievement of incremental benefits over what is currently being achieved through efforts such as those coordinated by UNCT (which we understand are numerous).</p> <p>12/21/12 CCM Clear.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) This is addressed only generally. Please revise with more specifics.</p> <p>Please explain how the stakeholder participation will be conducted and how this will lead to SLM and SFM.</p>	

		<p>Please explain how the benefit sharing regulations and guidelines will be developed and what are the incentives and how will they be funded.</p> <p>12/21/12 CCM Thank you for clarification. Clear.</p>	
	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)	<p>9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) Only generally. There is little in the way of specifics. Please provide better descriptions of risk mitigation. For example, in response to climate change, there is a mention of adaptive management but no description of how this will be used to mitigate risk.</p> <p>12/21/12 CCM Thank you. Clear.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) Only generally. More comprehensive treatment of this topic is needed. For example, because there is a large social component to this project, coordination with projects using community participation would be useful. Also, how does the REDD+ Readiness program and the technical support from Norway fit into this project? Please be specific about how these projects overlap and how they will be coordinated with this project.</p> <p>(NR - UA) Please clarify if there are any potential linkages to GEF's Greater Mekong Sub-region Forest and Biodiversity Program to be implemented by ADB (leading) & World Bank.</p> <p>12/21/12. Thank you for clarification. Clear.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) The focal point describes the role of the Ministry of</p>	

		Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation as ready to prepare the proposal and implement the project. 12/21/12 Clear.	
	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?	9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) Yes, the amount requested from GEF for this purpose it is less than 5% of the operational funds from the GEF for this project. However, there is a problem with calculation errors in the subtotal & total cofinancing in Table B. 12/21/12 Thank you. Clear.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) The cofinancing amount is very low: 1:2. While there are two potential cofinancing agencies, they are not yet identified. Also, as previously suggested the funding between LD and CCM should be more balanced, especially in Component 2, based on the objectives and expected outcomes. (NR - UA) Please note that subtotals and totals for co-financing are incorrectly calculated in Table B and are not consistent with Table A and C. Please correct Table B. 12/21/12 At CEO endorsement please	

		Clear.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) FAO has cofinanced \$500,000 and there are two other agencies that are potential cofinancers but they have not yet been identified. 12/21/12 Thank you for update on identifying cofunding and cofunders. At CEO endorsement please confirm higher cofinancing amounts and cofunders. Clear	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	9/24/2012 (NR-UA) Yes	
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	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	9/24/2012 (CCM-MB) No, please address requests for revision and clarification. One of the major review conclusions is that the PIF would need to be revised to	

		<p>program. GEF support would need to result in a credible and measurable reduction of pressure on forest resources with a clear catalytic effect. The main drivers of deforestation and forest degradation would need to be better addressed by the project. The project proponents are invited to contact the SFM/REDD+ team to discuss potential options to revise the PIF in this regard.</p> <p>12/21/12 Yes. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Funding allocation and co-financing amounts and composition to be revisited. Please confirm higher cofinancing amount and identify co-funders.</p> <p>Please elaborate on M&E system and provide metrics to be used. Also at this stage please provide details on the long-term financing for SLM/SFM.</p> <p>Please explain the UNREDD program under development and how it will be included as baseline for the projects during the project preparation stage.</p> <p>Please express throughout, including the tracking tool, the carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in CO2 equivalents. Examples can be found on pg. 22 of the LULUCF publication at this website: http://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/land-use-land-use-change-and-forestry-lulucf-activities</p> <p>Please clearly detail how they will</p>	

		nitrous oxide emissions in agricultural component. Please provide details including metrics for forest surveys and inventories and explain how data will be managed and stored.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 24, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 21, 2012	
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.