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

GEF ID:	**5702**		
Country/Region:	**Myanmar**		
Project Title:	**FishAdapt: Strengthening the adaptive capacity and resilience of fisheries and aquaculture-dependent livelihoods in Myanmar**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$6,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$12,385,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$18,535,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Fareeha Iqbal**	Agency Contact Person:	**David Brown**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	Yes. Myanmar is an LDC and is eligible for LDCF funding under the principle of equitable access.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes, a letter of endorsement from the OFP is attached, dated January 8, 2014.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes.	

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

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update, FI 4/29/14: Yes. However, please see comment for Item 24.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	Yes. The project is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability), CCA-2 (increasing adaptive capacity) and CCA-3 (technology transfer for adaptation).	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes. It is aligned with all four priorities identified for coastal zone resilience in Myanmar's NAPA (2013), including mangrove improvements, community based eco-friendly aquaculture systems, and small-scale aquaculture. The UN DAF for Myanmar specifies climate change as an important area, and the FAO Country Programme Framework for Myanmar identifies food security and agriculture (including fisheries and forestry) as key areas for assistance.	
	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes, the baseline problem and projects are sufficiently described. Myanmar is an LDC in which 1-3 million of the population is directly or indirectly involved in the marine/coastal and inland fisheries and aquaculture sectors. Fish	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		also constitute a part of the staple diet. The sector is expected to be adversely affected by climate change -- both long-term shifts and increased variability. The 6 baseline projects and programs identified include support for action plans in the fisheries sector, technologies and tools for fisheries and aquaculture, support for small-scale rice-fish culture and mangrove restoration, and food security and rural development. Although they address priority development areas for Myanmar, they neglect to take the potential impacts of climate change into account.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	FI, 2/19/2014: Not clear. (A) Components 2 and 3 include "community-level climate change vulnerability assessments", for fisheries and aquaculture, respectively. The GEF prefers that LDCF resources be used to finance actual on-the-ground adaptation actions, rather than vulnerability assessments (for which other funding sources exist); (B) Component 1.6 states that "a nation-wide, community-level monitoring system to assess and prepare for the impacts of climate change on fisheries and aquaculture" will be incorporated in relevant govt. agency programs. However, little additional detail has been provided in the PIF. Recommended action: (A) Please discuss whether LDCF	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		resources will be used to finance the vulnerability assessments. Could alternate sources of funding be used for these instead? (B) Will Component 1.6 actually have the stated scope (nation-wide, community-level)? Please provide additional details. Update, FI 4/29/14: Yes. The Agency has provided sufficient explanation on both counts. The "community vulnerability assessments" refer to an aspect of the participatory process through which adaptation actions will be specified and customized. Component 1.6 involves the setting up of a system to inform policy and planning on CC impacts on fisheries and aquaculture at the community, district and national levels.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	FI, 2/19/14: More information is requested. While the investment sub-components specify that "critical adaptation technologies and practices" will be piloted, there is little information on (i) the specific activities that will be undertaken; and (b) how these activities will go beyond addressing current needs and constraints (including risks posed by climate variability) to also consider the additional risks posed by climate change. Recommended action: If possible please provide more detail on the types of on-the-ground adaptation investments that will be made, as well as how these will go beyond good practice	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		in fisheries/mangrove/aquaculture management to provide adaptation solutions that will provide sustainable benefits in the face of risks posed by climate change. (For example, how will activities be resilient not only to drought, which is a current day problem, but to possibly more intense/frequent drought?) Update, FI 4/29/14: Yes, the Agency has provided more detail on potential on-the-ground investments and how these would provide additional adaptation benefits. Examples include: ensuring that fish refugia and breeding grounds are designed and managed to be resilient to climate change impacts such as worsened drought or salt water intrusion; managing changing water levels through installation of sluice gates; changes in fishing gear to adjust to species composition change; protection of fishing infrastructure in vulnerable coastal areas; and safer vessels as well as climate-resilient infrastructure to enable fisherfolk cope better with possible increases in climatic hazards; etc.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified	Yes for PIF stage. Various community stakeholders have been identified and their roles briefly discussed. The project	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and explicit means for their engagement explained?	will build the capacity of farmers and community members to better cope with climate variability and change. Fishing and farming communities will be involved in adaptation planning, co-management of the resource (e.g., fish, aquaculture species), and other project activities. By CEO Endorsement: Please provide additional information on how fishing and farming community members' views and inputs will be sought, i.e., the processes by which they were engaged.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes for PIF stage. Risks pertaining to community willingness, increased temperatures, extreme climatic events and communal violence have been addressed. By CEO Endorsement: Please also discuss any potential risks relating to project execution, coordination, and sustainability (including sustaining the capacities built).	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. The project is coordinated with a range of relevant GEF and non-GEF initiatives in-country, including: the UN-HABITAT 'Myanmar Climate Change Alliance Project'; the USAID-supported 'Farmer-to-Farmer' program to support aquaculture development; the GEF-funded 'Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project'; and a scientific survey that is underway of the fish resources and marine biodiversity of the Myanmar waters.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	Innovativeness: Yes. The project employs diverse approaches (policy, investment, research, capacity) to address priority adaptation needs through a food security approach focusing on 'climate smart fisheries'. This is an innovative project for Myanmar. Sustainability: Yes for PIF stage. Capacity building is an important element of this project. However, potential risks to sustainability have not yet been addressed and are requested by CEO endorsement (see comment for Item 11). Scale up: Yes. The project's focus on building technical capacity in the fisheries and aquaculture sector paves the way for future scale-up.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. About 70 percent of the requested LDCF funding is expected to support components that include on-the-ground adaptation investments.	
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate?	Yes. $12.385 million is being provided in co-financing through in-kind and grant financing from 6 baseline	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	projects/activities.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	Yes, at 4.7%.	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	Not yet. Please address comments for items 7 and 8. Update, 4/29/14, FI: Yes. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Items 10, 11 and 13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	February 19, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 29, 2014	
	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.**