



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

GEF ID:	9267		
Country/Region:	Myanmar		
Project Title:	Rural Productivity and Ecosystems Services Enhanced in Central Dry Zone Forest Reserves		
GEF Agency:	ADB	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):	LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$137,000	Project Grant:	\$4,650,000
Co-financing:	\$46,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$50,900,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	

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>	<p>FI, 8/13/15: Clarification requested. The project is aligned with LD-1 (Program 1), LD-2 (Program 3), CCM-1 (Program 1), CCM-2 (Program 4), BD 2 (Program 3) and SFM-3.</p> <p>The PIF states that the project is "consistent" with Aichi Targets 2, 5 and 7. Will it directly contribute to</p>	<p>10/29/2015: The project will contribute directly to these Aichi Targets. Adjustments to the activity set formulation and related indicators have been included in the revised PIF.</p> <p>Feb. 8, 2016: The project will directly contribute to four of the Aichi Targets: 2, 5, 7 and 14. Additional information and explanation</p>

<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>these targets? If so, please identify appropriate indicators to measure progress towards achieving them.</p> <p>FI, 2/3/2016: Agency is requested to briefly discuss in the PIF how the project will contribute to the identified Aichi Targets.</p> <p>FI, 2/8/2016: Cleared.</p>	<p>is provided in the project results framework and various sections of the PIF:</p> <p>a) Table B: inclusion of references. b) Section 6 (pp. 24-25) provides a table of information on relevance of project to Aichi Targets and possible benefits indicators.</p>
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The proposed project is aligned with Myanmar's (i) Action Programme to combat desertification under the UNCCD, which calls for greening of the central dry zone (CDZ); (ii) NBSAP, which identifies priority corridors in the CDZ; (iii) Initial Communication to the UNFCCC, which identifies agroforestry, forest conservation, reforestation/afforestation and provision of fuel-efficient cookstoves as appropriate climate change mitigation actions for the country; and (iv) initial candidate strategies to address drivers of forest degradation, identified in Myanmar's REDD+ Readiness Roadmap. It is also aligned with two long-term Government programs: the 'National Forest Master Plan', and 'Greening of Arid Areas in</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design		Central Myanmar'.	
	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, 8/13/15: Further information requested. The PIF discusses major drivers of environmental degradation. The CDZ is Myanmar's most water-stressed region, and frequent drought conditions are worsened by high deforestation rates spurred by agricultural expansion, commercial and illegal logging, biomass harvesting, overgrazing, and shifting cultivation. Governance is weak, and institutional overlap as well as barriers exist.</p> <p>Scaling: At this stage, the Agency is requested to provide brief information on potential for scale up (the PIF states that a scale-up &amp; replication strategy will be provided by CEO endorsement).</p> <p>Sustainability: Agency is requested to provide this information.</p> <p>Innovation: Agency is requested to provide this information.</p> <p>FI, 11/25/2015: While more info has been provided in the informal resubmission on scale-up</p>	<p>Agency, 10/29/2015: There will be scaling up undertaken in the context of the current GEF project implementation. In the revised PIF this is relevant to Output 3.2.1. The project also intends to create conditions for replication and scaling up of cost effective models for forest restoration in the CDZ. (linked to Output 3.1.1).</p> <p>The revised PIF provided more information on scaling, sustainability and innovation in the appropriate section (6).</p> <p>Agency, 1/11/2016: Among the priority actions to address sustainability, the project aims to strengthen the capacity of the Dry Zone Greening Department (DZGD, Forest Department, Environment Conservation Department, and associated regional, district and township level counterpart offices. We anticipate the capacity building to be across sectors, which would include corresponding representatives from the Irrigation Department. The aim will be to impart technical skills, knowledge and analytical / problem solving capabilities at the level of the senior civil service in</p>

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and innovative aspects of the project, the sustainability angle has not really been discussed. This is particularly important considering the dialogue we had on how the GEF project seems to be a bit of an adjunct to the quite 'distant' water infrastructure rehabilitation project.</p> <p>FI, 2/2/2016: Cleared. Additional information on sustainability aspects has been included in the PIF and Agency response.</p>	<p>order to improve delivery of programs on a long term basis. The relevant section in the PIF has some additional information.</p>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>FI, 8/13/15: More information needed. Table F is missing information on the GHG reduction benefits that will ensue from implementing this project. Please include this figure and explain how it was calculated. Please also include the number of hectares associated with BD benefits (Component 3) in Line 1 of Table F.</p> <p>The incremental benefits of some of the project activities over baseline actions are not clear. The baseline scenario (p.8) appears to be that DZGD is deploying 900,000 efficient cookstoves and large quantities of fuelwood substitute; constructing numerous ponds, RWH tanks and check dams; providing 1.4 million</p>	<p>10/29/2015: Provisional GHG emissions reduction benefits have been included using the FAO EX-ACT tool, and subject to validation during project preparation. The CDZ has about 3.4 million ha of forest, of which 1,099,191 ha are located in forest reserves. Given best available information, forest loss rates have been estimated 1.0% per annum.</p> <p>It is estimated that the project will contribute to a reduction of 10% per annum in the BAU rate of forest loss.</p> <p>The Mae-Nyo-Tuang forest reserve, will serve as one site model for restoration, providing direct emissions reduction benefits over 1,750 ha. The project will also scale up SFM, SLM/IWRM (and</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>seedlings and protecting 813,408 ha of natural forest. In this context, please explain the incremental benefits provided by proposed outputs 1.1.3 and 2.1.2 in Table B.</p> <p>The GEBs of the project, including BD, LD, and SFM benefits, need to be further articulated with tangible information, including coverage, species, and ecosystems.</p> <p>FI, 11/25/2015: Regarding the figures provided for avoided CO2 emissions, it would be better all-round if you can use a tool such as FAO's Ex-ACT. This eliminates the need for the Agency to spend a lot of time pulling out a methodology or for GEFSEC to verify that the methodology is valid. Ex-ACT generally only takes 20 minutes to provide a calculation once all the figures have been put in -- and if local data is not available the system will use defaults from IPCC. The figures provided in the response matrix seem the right order of magnitude but a printout from Ex-ACT would be easier.</p> <p>FI, 2/4/2016: Further information is requested.</p>	<p>other best practices) to around 5-7 other sites, tentatively providing indirect emissions reduction benefits covering 100,000 hectares (although the carbon balance calculation has used 50,000 as the target)</p> <p>Narrative on GEBs has been revised.</p> <p>1/11/2016: We have used the FAO EX-ACT to determine, provisionally, the tCO2 equivalent emissions avoided from various project inputs. As the FAO tool requires a number of assumptions, this would be subject to review/ verification during project preparation.</p> <p>Feb. 8, 2016:</p> <p>1) PIF revisions: - Additional presentation of information on threats to biodiversity included on p.9 (Section 1). - Further discussion on importance of integrating KBAs into biodiversity management and planning processes to conserve high value species in the CDZ on pp 13-14. - Expanded discussion on GEBs related to biodiversity on pp 19.</p> <p>2) PIF revisions:</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>1) On BD benefit: Brief information is required on the global significance of the biodiversity in the area, including dryland ecosystem, species, etc.), threats to the biodiversity, and tangible BD benefits that the project intends to achieve (including coverage, species, ecosystem goods and services, etc.)</p> <p>2) On CCM benefit:</p> <p>i) Further detail is needed for the second calculation (7.5 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e avoided) on the expected changes in the ecosystems, forest practices and modalities for scale-up.</p> <p>ii) Estimates for the third calculation (8,022,935 tCO<sub>2</sub>e avoided) appear too high. The proposal should explain how deforestation will be reduced 10% in such a large area (&gt;1 M ha).</p> <p>Recommended action for CCM: Please substitute a lower GHG benefits estimate in Table F, based on more conservative assumptions, and refine this estimate during PPG phase. By CEO Endorsement, please provide the EX-ACT results matrices (for direct and indirect GHG fluxes) as well as the assumptions and parameters that were used in estimation of the GHG benefit for</p>	<p>The PIF has been updated to clarify the approach and rationale for the GHG emissions reductions. The project approach will focus on 3 main elements:</p> <p>(i) developing a pilot demonstration at the Mae-Nyo-Taung Forest Reserve and surrounding villages to build capacity and establish working models for Integrated Soil and Water Resource Management (IS/WRM) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) across 10,500 ha. This includes 1,750 ha that will be subject to reforestation and assisted natural regeneration (ANR);</p> <p>(ii) Directly supporting field activities to scale the approach up to an additional 350,000 ha of forest reserves.</p> <p>(iii) Indirectly supporting the scale-up of the approach to a further 919,500ha through policy reforms, capacity development, management planning and the development of financial resource mobilization strategies.</p> <p>- Table B has been updated with revised GHG targets.</p> <p>- Estimate in Table F revised accordingly.</p> <p>- The narrative and GHG targets under Component 3 have been revised accordingly on pp15-16.</p> <p>- Section 5 on GEBs modified with</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>each of the 3 sub-components.</p> <p>FI and PM, 2/8/2016: it is still unclear how the best practices, once identified, will be scaled up to cover 50,000 ha, and moreover, an additional surface as large as 300,000 ha. More details are needed in particular about the ways "at least 3 of 4 conditions" (p.15) would be met to achieve so-called "functional management". We recommend the following:</p> <p>1. FOR PIF STAGE: Due to remaining uncertainties on the achievement of effective scale-up, the agency is requested to remove the GHG benefit calculation associated with the functional management of the 300,000 ha (the Agency should retain the objectives of conservation and reduced annual deforestation in this area, however).</p> <p>2. FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT STAGE: More detail is requested to demonstrate the possibility of scale-up, identifying the modalities and activities envisaged (for the 50,000 ha as well as for the 300,000 ha). The activities that will be supported by the co-financing (about \$34 M for</p>	<p>revised GHG targets (p.18). - Annex 1 provides explanation of project approach and scaling up methodology with respect to CCM benefits.</p> <p>Assumptions will be reviewed during project preparation, and EX-ACT matrices submitted with Request for CEO Endorsement</p> <p>Feb. 9, 2016:</p> <p>ANNEX 1 provides an explanation of the project approach and methodology with respect to field sites, up-scaling and GHG emissions reductions</p> <p>Table B has been modified, and the narrative on pp 15-16 revised to provide additional clarity. The scaling up strategy, as it is being currently considered, will consist of two sub-components.</p> <p>With respect to the greenhouse gas benefits under component 3, there will be 3 expected outcome:</p> <p>Under outcome 3.1, the project will develop a model for SFM and community based land and water management within and around the Mae-</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component 3, relative to the GEF's \$2.2 M), will also need to be more fully explained. With these further inputs, and demonstrating the feasibility for scale-up, it could be possible to consider including, in the environmental benefits calculation, the GHG emission reduction from the reduction of deforestation by the "functional management" of the 300,000 ha.</p> <p>FI, 2/9/2016: Cleared. Agency has followed the recommended action.</p>	<p>Nyo-Taung Forest Reserve. This will include demonstrations for assisted natural regeneration and reforestation. This will reduce rates of land degradation, restore ecosystem services and generate GHG emissions reductions and sequestration.</p> <p>Under Outcome 3.2, the project will scale-up the SL/WM practices across 50,000ha of agro-ecological landscapes. This will involve the development of a replication and scale-up strategy, supported by training, farm level extension support, and small scale remedial / rehabilitation investments. These activities will linked directly to farmer support initiatives that will be part of the ADB loan project.</p> <p>Under Outcome 3.3 further scale-up activities will focus on introducing SFM and biodiversity conservation within 5-7 additional forest reserves and/or KBAs, with the aim of reducing rates of deforestation across 300,000 ha. This would be led by the Government, with project support in the form of: site prioritization, replication and financial strategies, technical support to design functional management plans, training and capacity building, and some field support. The project will explore potential sites and GHG emissions</p>



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>reduction potential during project preparation.</p> <p>In line with the GEF review, the GHG benefits have been modified accordingly. We have retained the GHG estimate for the 50,000 ha under component 3, and have excluded the estimate for the additional 300,000ha. All estimates will be confirmed at the CEO Endorsement Stage following additional studies.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>FI, 8/10/15 Not quite.</p> <p>1) Please identify INV components in Table B (currently all TA).</p> <p>2) The PIF seems to have a greater focus on LD Program 3 than LD Program 1. We suggest redistributing the requested LD resources so that a larger proportion is targeting the former.</p> <p>3) Please clarify the area (ha) that will benefit from SFM financing. Between afforestation/reforestation and assisted natural regeneration (output 2.1.1), it seems that SFM financing would support only 1,500 ha -- this seems very low for the requested finance.</p> <p>4) In general, the proposed project seems very assessment/monitoring</p>	<p>Agency, 10/29/2015:</p> <p>1) Component 1 will consist of both TA and investment activities (roughly - TA US\$ 443,000, and INV US\$ 750,000). Activities under Component 3 are expected to have higher levels of investment.</p> <p>2) Done.</p> <p>3) Based on DZDG estimates, the costs of ANR to be USD 600-800 / ha, and reforestation to be USD 1200-1500 /ha. While these seem comparatively high, there are a number of factors that bear consideration. These include the potentially higher input costs for water, pumping equipment, small scale irrigation, seeds, nursery development and management, planting materials, long term maintenance and protection, and relatively high rate of loss due to harsh climate and disease. Site visits confirm that planting itself is labour intensive due to the hard, compacted</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>heavy and offers little in terms of investment. It would also be good to see more focus on institutional strengthening, which could contribute to increased sustainability of the project activities and lend the project 'vision' as well as potential for long-term impact.</p> <p>5) It is currently difficult to get a sense of how the 3 aspects (LD, SFM and BD) relate to each other across the project. Will their geographies overlap within the CDZ, or are they distinct? How will execution of the different components be coordinated institutionally?</p> <p>6) Parts of the CDZ (e.g., Magway region) are known to suffer from high forest fire incidence (anthropogenic in origin). Please discuss how the project will take this into account.</p> <p>7) Please include text on coordination with the following Australian Govt. supported projects: 'Improving livelihoods of small-scale livestock producers in the central dry zone of Myanmar through research on animal production and health', 'Strengthening institutional capacity and extension services affecting the acceptability and adoption of promising</p>	<p>soil, and size / depth of the holes that need to be dug for planting and wide spacing. Preliminary reports from the ADB PPTA (loan project) indicate agricultural labour costs to be higher in the CDZ than other parts of the country. Given the above, the targets were set to be "achievable". Project preparation will re-affirm these factors and build in steps to develop a cost effective model for SFM applicable to CDZ forest reserves. The revised PIF increases the area under ANR to 1000 ha.</p> <p>4) Clarifications and revisions on assessments have been included in the revised PIF. The integrated spatial analysis in Component 1 will cut across all components.</p> <p>5) The PIF has been revised to strengthen integration across LD, CCM, BD and SFM. The project will aim to increase forest cover at the project site through a range of functional measures: a) strengthened forest management, b) re-forestation , c) introduction of efficient energy options, d) integrated water and soil management approaches etc. Component 1 activities will focus on the Mae-Nyo-Taung and surrounding communities (16 villages, 10,600 ha). Activities related to Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.2.1 under Component 3 will be district level - including Miektila Lake as well</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>technologies in the central dry zone and Ayeyarwaddy Delta regions of Myanmar' and 'Increasing productivity of legume-based farming systems in the central dry zone of Myanmar'</p> <p>8) Please consider the following potential risks: (i) lack of sustained community support or engagement in project activities; and (ii) impacts of climate change and/or increased variability (e.g., on water availability; crop and livestock resilience to high temps., drought, disease; forest fires).</p> <p>FI, 11/25/2015: We discussed that ADB would also conduct an assessment of the regulatory and policy framework that governs land rights and use, forest protection, etc., with a view to providing recommendations for legal reform.</p> <p>FI, 2/3/2016: Further information is requested. 1) On component 1, the outputs are still quite general (e.g. capacity development, technical assistance on SLM/IWRM). Are these outputs focused on training, tools, analysis -- or what exactly?</p>	<p>as Popa Mountain National Park. Under Component 3 , activities for Output 3.1 will be only in the FR, while 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 will be in selected FRs in other parts of the CDZ (Detailed maps will be developed during project preparation) At the implementation level, coordination will be guided by a multi-stakeholder project steering committee, chaired at Vice-Minister or DG level, and supported by technical working groups / committees consisting of key personnel from various agencies, CSOs, universities and private sector as appropriate.</p> <p>6) The project will ensure that management plans include capacity enhancement for forest fire awareness/monitoring, prevention, risk reduction, preparedness and response is included. Fire management is one module included in activities related to Output 3.2.2., as well as the work of both FD and DZGD. Collaboration will also be sought with the proposed FAO/GEF project on "Fire Adapt: Climate Smart Fire Management of Rural Landscapes" which is in the GEF-6 pipeline.</p> <p>7) Done.</p> <p>8) Done.</p> <p>Agency, 1/11/2016: Component 4 has been modified to</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2) On coordination: Is the UNDP project on "Addressing CC Risks..." the Adaptation Fund project? If so, please clearly state this, and by the time of CEO endorsement please also identify clear institutional coordination mechanisms.</p> <p>FI, 2/8/2016: Cleared.</p>	<p>include activity sets.</p> <p>Feb. 8, 2016:</p> <p>1) The strategy under Component 1 is to first build capacity (field trials, training of trainers etc) of DZGD, Forest Department and other agencies in IS/WRM tools and processes. Then, technical assistance and training packages will be designed and delivered to communities in the Mae-Nyo-Taung forest reserve and surrounding area. The steps in the IS/WRM process and various approaches, remedial / intervention options and specific actions is presented in the relevant section (pp 11-12). A further elaboration on potential training packages under scaling up scenario is presented on p.15.</p> <p>2) Done. Consultations to define coordinating mechanisms with the UNDP Adaptation Fund project will be undertaken during project preparation.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>FI, 8/13/15: Further information requested. The project will develop and follow recommendations of a 'Gender Action Plan', in efforts to ensure women's participation and representation, and their access to project benefits.</p> <p>Please provide information on whether and how the project will</p>	<p>Agency, 10/29/2015:</p> <p>Minority ethnic groups make up over 30% of the population. Increased efforts are being made towards recognition of rights, however, the main groups are located in the southern coastal areas and mountainous terrain central lowlands (Karen, Shan, Mon, Chin, Kachin, Rakhine and Karenni States). DZDG confirms no indigenous groups are</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>affect indigenous peoples, as well as how civil society groups will be engaged in design and implementation of the project.</p> <p>FI, 11/25/2015: We talked about the relationship between the local communities and the authorities, particularly user rights access etc. It would be fair to say that relations have not always been harmonious and therefore the project may well need to bulk up this component to get true buy in from communities and build a project profile that is workable with the communities, otherwise long term viability of the project itself would be questionable. We discussed the need for the basics of identifying stakeholders, users and uses and clarifying rights.</p> <p>FI, 2/3/2016 -- to be done by CEO Endorsement stage: Development of Gender Action Plan is welcome and a good practice, but please make sure that these elements (e.g. indicators and targets) are integrated in the project results framework at the CEO endorsement stage.</p>	<p>located in and around the project main forest reserve site. Due diligence will be undertaken during project preparation and ADB safeguards principles will be applied as appropriate.</p> <p>Project preparation will also develop a stakeholder involvement plan, in which CSOs (among others) will be identified, and respective project roles defined. The Environment Conservation Department (ECD) of MOECAP is finalizing a mapping exercise of CSOs in the country that are undertaking programs related to environmental issues. This information will reside with the GEF OFP (DDG of ECD), and be used to guide project preparation. An inception workshop will bring together the relevant CSOs (including those linked to the UNDP Adaptation Fund Project).</p> <p>Agency, 1/11/2016: The DZGD already works closely with communities living in and around the forest reserve areas. This is facilitated at the household level by the front line technicians in the township and district level offices. It is understood that there needs to be a level of trust established between the government authorities and communities. The general approach in the project is to strengthen capacity of the DZGD and other agencies to deliver</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>a range of support services to communities. At the same time, efforts will be made to increase the absorptive and retention capacity of communities ‘ through the training and technical assistance planned under the various components. The forest and water user groups will serve as a mechanism for dialogue on issues related to user rights, accessibility etc.</p> <p>Social marketing and community mobilization activities are planned under Component 2, to increase levels of trust, understanding and participation of communities in forest management. Some work will be supported build capacity of forest user groups, particularly in areas under community forests (CF). It should be noted that not all forest reserves contain areas for CF, and if so, the CFs are generally small (between 20 and 40 ha).</p> <p>Capacity building and training in the scaling up component will also benefit from existing relationships between the UNDP/DZGD project, which uses CSOs, NGOs and other community-based organizations as mechanisms for delivery.</p> <p>The additional activity set on policy reform will serve as a forum in which</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			land use rights can be discussed and clarified.  Feb. 8, 2016: Table B includes some early references. We note the advice on Gender Action Plan development.
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes, the proposed FA funding is within the 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.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	Yes. There is a 2:1 ratio across the total requested FA STAR amounts (LD, BD, CCM) and the requested SFM financing.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	FI, 8.13.15: No. Please address comments for Items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Overall, CCM, BD and SFM aspects need to be strengthened.  The Agency is requested to also explore concrete options for potential	Agency, 10/29/2015: The PIF was developed in close consultation with the DZDG, FD and ECD in MOECAAF, based on a proposal received by the Agency in December 2014. Three ADB missions were undertaken to Nay Pyi Taw, Mandalay and the Mae-Nyo Taung Forest Reserve

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>synergy with current and evolving GEF6 programming in Myanmar.</p> <p>FI, 11/25/2015:</p> <p>1) Institutional coordination: We discussed the need to establish and maintain lines of communication and active engagement across the CDZ Greening Dept. (proposed EA for GEF TF project) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (EA for baseline irrigation project), with a view to ensuring greater integration/coordination of the GEF project with the baseline one, thereby enhancing prospects for the success and sustainability of both.</p> <p>2) Coordination with additional GEF projects: Please also coordinate with UNDP (Ridge-to-Reef), FAO (which is planning to build on the UNDP Ridge-to-Reef project) and UNEP (an LDCF community forestry project in the CDZ is under preparation (PMIS ID 5567)).</p> <p>3) Overall: We would suggest revisiting the specific activities of the project in Table B after you have been able to consider the bigger question of how it is a real part of the water infrastructure rehabilitation. Our concern is that as it stands the project</p>	<p>area to crystallize the concept. The Government of Myanmar wishes to advance a few priority projects for the next GEF-6 Council. The current PIF was identified and approved at the Ministerial level prior to GEF OFP Endorsement.</p> <p>ADB is in close communications with the GEF OFP in the development of the GEF-6 pipeline. The current GEF project in CDZ is complementary to several of the advanced concepts in the GEF-6 pipeline. The "Coordination" section of the PIF outlines some of the early thinking on this. These synergies will be explored further in the upcoming national dialogue and beyond.</p> <p>Agency, 1/11/2016:</p> <p>In relation to the ADB loan project, it should be noted that the DZGD and FD have very little, if any, historical collaboration with the Irrigation Department, so we would essentially be helping them establish a fresh relationship. It will take some time to build these bridges, however we have been clear with the DZGD that they need to adopt cross sectoral, participatory approaches to implementation of their programs. Initial consultations have begun with the Irrigation Department.</p>



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>could be easily sidelined/ignored unless it is truly a component part of the larger infrastructure project. The example we talked about was if dams are rehabilitated then the project could be a component part of making sure reservoirs are not re-silted rapidly through ongoing deforestation, land degradation and loss of soil. At the moment these links are not clear and the concern is that with such a large and active engineering project ongoing the 'softer' green elements in the PIF are too easily cast aside. Hence revisiting what the GEF funds can do to as an inherent part of the infrastructure project is needed.</p> <p>FI, 2/4/16: Not yet. Agency is requested to address comments for Items 1, 4 and 5.</p> <p>FI, 2/8/2016: Not yet. Agency is requested to please address comment for Item 4.</p> <p>FI, 2/9/2016: Yes.</p>	<p>The specific actions proposed to strengthen linkages and synergies between the projects are presented in Section 5 of the revised PIF, which we would elaborate during project preparation (during which a number of collaborative meetings will be organized).</p> <p>In this connection we are also hoping that the ADB Myanmar Resident Mission and the GMS Environment Operations Centre, based in the Thailand Resident Mission, will also play a supporting role</p> <p>We have reached out to a FAO, UNDP and UNEP as suggested. To date we have had good consultations with UNDP in country. The tightest collaboration will be with the UNDP Adaptation Fund project, as this is also being implemented with the DZGD as "interlocutor".</p> <p>There are some information sharing opportunities with the UNDP R2R Integrated Protected Area Land and Seascape Management in Tanintharyi Project, particularly in relation to the work on strengthening management and threat reduction in the target PAs and buffer zones. Further consultations will need to be undertaken.</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>UNEP has indicated that they have taken some time to get the project underway. We anticipate consultations with them in the next few weeks. No response from FAO yet, but we will press them further.</p> <p>Overall: A number of revisions have been introduced, including re-formatting of the results framework, consolidating / tightening up of activities/outputs, and re-distribution of some resources.</p> <p>We have made efforts to include the GEF project as a component within the larger ADB loan project. One measure has been to link directly to the Irrigation Modernization component of the loan project, hence reducing the co-finance from US\$ 75 mil to US\$ 45 mil.</p> <p>We will continue to work on fostering greater synergy. It is important to note that the ADB loan is not really building new infrastructure, rather, the focus will be on rehabilitation, upgrading, modernization and improving operational efficiency and management of irrigation systems. In fact some activities, such as watershed rehabilitation and strengthening capacity of water user groups, and small scale irrigation, are also included in the</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>activity sets for the loan project.</p> <p>Further the ADB loan (second component) is also supporting agricultural value chains promotion to improve practices, diversify crops and strengthen market linkages among others. This has some relevance to SLM work under the GEF project.</p> <p>One important element of the collaboration with MOAI will be the support for policy dialogue and reform processes related to the proposed Water Law and National Water Policy.</p>
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 14, 2015	October 29, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 25, 2015	January 11, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 04, 2016	February 08, 2016

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> 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)		

<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.