



Integrated Approach in the Management of Major Biodiversity Corridors (IA-Biological Corridors)

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

9584

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

Project Title

Integrated Approach in the Management of Major Biodiversity Corridors (IA-Biological Corridors)

Countries

Philippines

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s):

Biodiversity Management Bureau and Forest Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)

Executing Partner Type

Multilateral

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Influencing models, Community-based adaptation, Climate Change Adaptation, Climate Change, Focal Areas, Livelihoods, Climate information, Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Small Island Developing States, Climate resilience, Ecosystem Approach, Sustainable Land Management, Land Degradation, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Agriculture, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Sustainable Pasture Management, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Sustainable Forest, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Fire Management, Sustainable Livelihoods, Income Generating Activities, Land Productivity, Land Degradation Neutrality, Tourism, Mainstreaming, Biodiversity, Fisheries, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Extractive Industries, Tropical Rain Forests, Biomes, Rivers, Tropical Dry Forests, Grasslands, Wetlands, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Productive Seascapes, Invasive Alien Species, Species, Threatened Species, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Financial and Accounting, Local Communities, Stakeholders, SMEs, Private Sector, Large corporations, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Education, Communications, Public Campaigns, Awareness Raising, Behavior change, Community Based Organization, Civil Society, Academia, Non-Governmental Organization, Beneficiaries, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender Equality, Women groups, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Capacity Development, Gender results areas, Access to benefits and services, Participation and leadership, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Access and control over natural resources, Innovation, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Adaptive management, Learning, Indicators to measure change, Theory of change, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Demonstrate innovative approaches, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 0

Duration

72In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

1,103,422

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1_P2	BD Objective 1: Improve sustainability of protected area systems and Program 2: Nature's Last Stand: Expanding the Reach of the Global Protected Area Estate	GET	5,000,370	9,376,070
BD-4_P9	BD Objective 4: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and seascapes and sectors and Program 9: Managing the Human- Biodiversity Interface	GET	5,113,370	15,116,829
LD-3_P4	LD Objective 3: Integrated landscapes and Program 4: Scaling-up Sustainable Land Management through Landscape Approach	GET	859,950	13,426,332
SFM-1	Maintained Forest Resources: Reduce the pressures on high conservation value forests by addressing the drivers of deforestation	GET	751,612	13,529,394
SFM-2	Enhanced Forest Management: Maintain flows of forest ecosystem services and improve resilience to climate change through SFM.	GET	534,939	11,252,382
Total Project Cost(\$)			12,260,241	62,701,007

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

Operationalise integrated management of biological corridors to generate multiple benefits including effective conservation of globally significant biodiversity, reduced deforestation and degradation and enhanced livelihoods.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------	------------	---------------------------	----------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Effective coordination and governance framework for integrated biodiversity management in the Philippines biodiversity corridors system	Technical Assistance	<p><i>Outcome 1: Effective policy, coordination, regulatory and institutional framework for planning, management, compliance monitoring, enforcement and decision making for integrated management of biodiversity corridors developed. This will be indicated by:</i></p> <p><i>(A) At least six policy instruments (updated safeguard standards and guidelines)[1] for improving biodiversity outcomes within the biodiversity corridors developed and adopted</i></p> <p><i>(B) Average ncrease of institutional capacity as measured by a 15-20 point increase in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard of baseline values of:</i></p> <p><i>(i) DENR 47/74</i></p> <p><i>(ii) DA 28/42</i></p> <p><i>(iii) NCIP 16/39</i></p> <p><i>(C) All protected areas (11) and OECMs (at least 13) within two biodiversity corridors have moved to automated system of monitoring of biodiversity and threats (current automation zero)</i></p> <p><small>[1] Specifically includes policies to incorporate biodiversity and gender considerations in biodiversity-friendly agriculture policy, extractive industries policy, biodiversity-friendly enterprise policy and local governance policy and improved guidelines (based on experiences from the ground) for</small></p>	<p><i>Output 1.1: Functional governance and coordination mechanism established at national level to facilitate integrated ecosystem planning and management of Biodiversity Corridors through (i) creation of national technical working group on biodiversity corridors as an interim forum for national dialogue; (ii) support DENR efforts to strengthen cross-sectoral planning functions; and (iii) support government decision for creation of national and sub-national planning and coordination mechanisms for strengthening biodiversity and gender integration with sector, regional, provincial, local government,</i></p>	GET	1,283,653	12,561,525

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 2: Application of network design and integrated management of biodiversity corridors to ensure continued stability and sustainability of their biological, ecosystem services and socio-economic conservation values	Technical Assistance	<p><i>Outcome 2: Improved site-level planning, regulatory, monitoring and implementation framework for demonstration of integrated ecosystem planning and management of pilot biodiversity corridors. This will be indicated by:</i></p> <p><i>(A) At least 200,000 hectares of biological corridors under improved management practices through establishment and improved management of Other Effective Area-based Conservation Efforts (OECMs) through ICCAs[1], LCAs and privately owned conservation estates.[2]</i></p> <p><i>(B) Average increase by at least 20 points in METT from current PAs baselines covering 300,000 ha from current baselines of:</i></p> <p><i>(i) Mt. Iglit Baco NP: 67;</i></p> <p><i>(ii) Mt. Calavite WS: 67;</i></p> <p><i>(iii) Agusan Marsh WS: 55</i></p> <p><i>(iv) Alamio, Buayan, Caracan, Panikian River and Sipangpang Falls Watershed FR: 15</i></p> <p><i>(v) Aliwagwag Protected Landscape: 26</i></p> <p><i>(vi) Andanan Watershed FR: 30</i></p> <p><i>(v) Cabadbaran Watershed: 20</i></p> <p><i>(vi) Mainit Hotspring Protected Landscape: 42</i></p> <p><i>(vii) Mati Protected Landscape: 20</i></p> <p><i>(viii) Mt. Hamiguitan Range WS: 59</i></p> <p><i>(ix) Surigao Watershed FR: 17</i></p> <p><i>(C) Key species populations stable or increasing from baseline</i></p>	<p><i>Output 2.1: Integrated ecosystem management framework developed and adopted for two biodiversity corridors through (i) internal dialogue and planning across DENR Bureaus and Regional Offices to support corridor consensus building; (ii) assembling existing information, stocktaking and preparation of corridor maps; (iii) inter-disciplinary discussion to assemble, review and update conservation targets; (iv) organization of multisectoral corridor advisory committees; (v) indepth assessment and mapping of values and threats in corridors; (vi) consensus on application and enforcement of</i></p>	GET	5,174,882	18,990,111

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3: Community-based sustainable use and management systems in the two pilot biodiversity corridor system in the Philippines	Technical Assistance	<p><i>Outcome 3: Sustainable use and management systems for land and forest resources that are compatible with integrated ecosystem management corridor objectives implemented. This will be indicated by:</i></p> <p><i>(A) Total C benefits of 11,594,267 metric tons of CO₂ over 10 year period as follows:</i></p> <p><i>(i) C sequestered in agriculture, forestry and other land uses of 3,724,738 metric tons of CO₂ over 10 year period and (ii) avoided emissions of 7,869,529 metric tons of CO₂ over 10 year period</i></p> <p><i>(B) At least 65,000 individuals, with which 30% are indigenous peoples (belonging to 15,000 households) directly benefit through sustainable natural resource management and livelihood improvement approaches and increase of 15% in average economic benefit (at least 50% of beneficiaries are women, with which 25% are IP women</i></p> <p><i>(C) At least the following targets will be achieved/improved; (a) 15,000 of degraded agricultural lands restored under SLM production systems; (b) 15,000 ha of disturbed forest lands under improved SFM practices; and (c) 30,000 ha critical ecosystems under improved management^[1]</i></p> <p><i>(D) Forest certification systems adopted nationally by DENR based on lessons from 3 sites including 2 community managed forests and one privately managed forest pilot</i></p>	<p><i>Output 3.1: Voluntary forest certification system piloted for local communities and privately managed forests through (i) development of standards for Philippine forest certification scheme (PFSC); (ii) develop policies, processes and procedures for implementing PFSC; (iii) draft Administrative Order fo implementation of PFSC; (iv) support establishment of organization and institutional structure for PFSC; (iv) institute capacity building for PFSC; (v) develop communication tools for promoting PFSC; (v) map and inventory cluster sites (3 pilot sites) for PFCS; (vi) collaborate with relevant local forest</i></p>	GET	4,326,495	15,704,716

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 4: Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming, learning and monitoring and evaluation	Technical Assistance	<p><i>Outcome 4: Awareness and collaborative decision-making on Integrated Ecosystem Management enhanced through effective knowledge management and gender mainstreaming. This will be indicated by:</i></p> <p><i>(A) At least 60% (of which at least 40% women) of sampled community members, government and sector agency staff, private sector, local communities, indigenous peoples and other stakeholders aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments and behavior change for biodiversity outcomes</i></p> <p><i>(B) 100 % increase in number of inter-sectoral users from baseline of the Integrated decision support system/ integrated information management system to monitor biodiversity threats and outcomes in place and effectively used</i></p> <p><i>(C) At least thirty good practice in conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and adapted</i></p>	<p><i>Output 4.1: Knowledge Management and Communications, Gender Mainstreaming and Monitoring and Evaluation strategies developed and implemented through:</i></p> <p><i>(i) development and implementation of knowledge management and communication action plans for each corridor; (ii) implementation of gender action plan, including training of staff on gender mainstreaming; (iii) review and update of M&E plan; and (vi) conduct of mid-term and terminal evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>Output 4.2: Harmonized information management system to integrate lessons</i></p>	GET	891,390	5,458,212

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				Sub Total (\$)	11,676,420	52,714,564
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
				GET	583,821	9,986,443
				Sub Total(\$)	583,821	9,986,443
				Total Project Cost(\$)	12,260,241	62,701,007

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
Government	Department of Environment and Natural Resources	Grant	39,539,455
Government	Department of Environment and Natural Resources	In-kind	3,351,573
Government	Department of Agriculture	Grant	11,936,960
Government	Department of Agriculture	In-kind	356,404
Government	Department of Trade and Industry - PTTC	In-kind	166,609
Government	Province of Surigao del Norte	In-kind	99,822
Government	Province of Davao Oriental	Grant	348,581
Government	Province of Davao Oriental	In-kind	21,461
Private Sector	Agala Mining Ventures, Inc	Grant	189,324
Private Sector	Taganito Mining Corporation	Grant	565,000
Private Sector	Taganito HPAL Nickel Corporation	Grant	186,931
Private Sector	Philsaga Mining Corporation	Grant	849,282
Private Sector	Mindanao Mineral Processing & Refining Corporation	Grant	142,982
Private Sector	Marcventures Mining & Development Corporation	Grant	86,741
Private Sector	CTP Construction and Mining Corporation –Adlay Project	Grant	247,686

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
Private Sector	CTP Construction and Mining Corporation – Dahican Nickel Project	Grant	242,230
Private Sector	Platinum Group Metals Corporation	Grant	622,464
Private Sector	Greenstone Resources Corporation	Grant	23,000
Private Sector	Carrascal Nickel Corporation	Grant	19,231
CSO	Center for Conservation Innovations	Grant	1,000,000
CSO	Haribon Foundation	Grant	546,260
CSO	Mindoro Biodiversity Conservation Foundation	Grant	326,923
CSO	Philippine Eagle Foundation	Grant	19,231
CSO	Conservation International	Grant	312,857
GEF Agency	United Nations Development Program	Grant	1,500,000
Total Co-Financing(\$)			62,701,007

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Philippines	Biodiversity		No	10,113,740	910,237
UNDP	GET	Philippines	Land Degradation		No	859,950	77,395
UNDP	GET	Philippines	Multi Focal Area	SFM	No	1,286,551	115,790
Total Grant Resources(\$)						12,260,241	1,103,422

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	300,648.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	---------------------------

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	300,648.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Agusan Marsh Wildlife Sanctuary	125689 145492	Select		40,752.00			55.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Alamio, Buyaan, Carac-an, Panikian Rivers and Sipangpang Falls Watershed Forest Reserve	125689 555583095	Select		5,784.00			15.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Aliwagwag Protected Landscape	125689 555583080	Select		11,570.00			26.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Andanan River Watershed Forest Reserve	125689 306540	Select		15,097.00			30.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Cabadbaran Watershed Forest Reserve	125689 306541	Select		15,776.00			20.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Expansion of existing PAs above	125689	Select		65,000.00					<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Mainit Hot Spring Protected Landscape	125689 7232	Select		8,098.00			42.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Mati Protected Landscape	125689 306531	Select		1,067.00			20.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Mount Calavite Wildlife Sanctuary	125689 14729	Select		14,707.00			67.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Mount Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary	125689 555583083	Select		15,830.00			59.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Mts. Iglit-Baco Natural Park	125689 1337	Select		106,000.00			67.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Surigao Watershed Forest Reserve	125689 306539	Select		967.00			17.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	30000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	15,000.00		

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	15,000.00		

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	0.00		

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	200000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	200,000.00		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification			
Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)				
Title		Submitted		
Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated				
Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	0	7271000	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	0	10232000	0	0

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)		7,271,000		
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)		10,232,000		
Anticipated start year of accounting		2020		
Duration of accounting		20		

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		32,500		
Male		32,500		

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Total	0	65000	0	0

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

There are no significant changes in the project design from the original PIF. During the PPG stage, Outcomes and Outputs have undergone very minor modification as required to improve the design of the project and reflect the outcomes of PPG consultations and assessments. All original elements of the PIF are still included in the Outcome and Output statements of the project as detailed in Table B. These are further detailed in *Section A.1.3 of this CEO Endorsement Request and Annex G of GEFCEO ER*.

The co-financing amount has slightly decreased/increased from the PIF estimate of USD 67,500,320 to 62,701,007

1) Global environmental problems, threats, root causes and barriers to be addressed.

There are no significant changes from the PIF. Through the PPG process - threats, impacts, and barriers presented in the original PIF have been further refined and elaborated through consultations. Please refer to *Section II Development challenge in the UNDP Project Document for details*.

2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.

There are no significant change from the PIF. However, *Section II Development challenge, baseline scenario and Section IV Results and Partnerships, Part on “Partnerships and Stakeholder engagement” of the UNDP Project Document* identify a wider range of partners that would be involved in project implementation and include baseline initiatives (including baseline budget estimates) that will contribute to the results of the project.

3) Proposed alternative scenario, with brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

The relevance and feasibility of the proposed outcomes and outputs have been confirmed (*Refer Figure 2 for Theory of Change and Section IV, of UNDP Project Document*) through additional expert review and through extensive consultations during the preparation phase of the project (*Refer Section IV “Results and Partnerships”, Stakeholder engagement plan of UNDP Project Document*). Project indicators and targets have been refined to reflect on-ground practicalities and ecological considerations. Some modifications from the original PIF as discussed below:

In order to ensure that there is a structured approach to the design of the project, Component 1 focus on national foundational activities (policies, procedures, guidelines and regulatory systems) that are needed to promote an integrated management of biological corridors. Component 2 and 3 focuses on trialing the integrated planning and management of two pilot corridors. Component 2, in particular focuses on improved protected area management systems and integration of such approaches at sub-national and local level planning systems and Component 2 on the implementation of SFM and SLM activities, including the rehabilitation of degraded agricultural lands to improve their productivity. A new component (Component 4) has been added to cover knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation. As a consequence, there has been some reorganization of outputs from the original PIF. Targets of SLM, SFM and mainstreaming of biodiversity in provincial, regional and municipal plans have been revised taking into

consideration existing institutional capacity, resource availability and time constraints. Detailed changes from the PIF and rationale for these changes are presented in greater detail in Annex G of GEFCEO ER.

Response to Project Reviews (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion, and responses to comments from the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF) is provided in **Annex B of the GEFCEO ER**.

4) Alignment with GEF focal area strategies

The project addresses the GEF-6 BD Focal Area Program 9 objective – Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface. The project is particularly aligned with the core activities of GEF Program 9 aimed at managing the human-biodiversity interface that can help maintain the integrity of the protected areas while ensuring persistence of biodiversity in more expansive landscapes. To achieve this, the project will embed biodiversity conservation and sustainability objectives in the management of wider production landscapes in two biological corridors through support to an array of policies, strategies, and practices that engage key public and private sector actors in order to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity. Through more careful targeting, support under this program is expected to better deliver multiple conservation outcomes: sustaining biodiversity in the production landscape and which will simultaneously secure the ecological integrity and sustainability of protected area systems. The project also address the GEF-6 LD Focal Area Program 4 objective - Scaling-up Sustainable Land Management through Landscape Approach. The project will support efforts to improve production landscapes with environmental benefits and encourage wider application of innovative tools and practices for natural resource management. This will include approaches at improving soil productive, water resource management, and vegetation cover in production landscapes systems as to to benefit land users most vulnerable to land degradation. The project will support specific roles of men and women in these systems through (i) capacity development and grant financing for sustainable land and forest management; (ii) multi-stakeholder planning at the biological corridor level involving both public and private sectors to inform decision-making on integrated management of ecosystem services; and (iii) improving agricultural land management within key biological areas to improve forest connectivity through empowerment of local communities in decision-making and management of productive assets. In keeping with SFM Program 1, the project intends to address the drivers of the loss of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) by supporting a range of national, regional, provincial and municipal governance and planning measures that recognizes the values and incorporates these biological assets (including protected areas) in socio-economic planning and programs. In doing so, it is expected that decisions will be made to avoid the loss and fragmentation of these valuable ecological systems and the services they provide. In accordance with SFM Program 2, the project entails to entrust the direct management of forest stewardship to local communities, in particular Indigenous People through support for Other Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs) by strengthening forest governance, improving tenure arrangements and livelihood opportunities (forest and non-forest based). Capacity development for SFM will be supported along with technical support for community forest management. In addition, the project will work with extractive industries to improve their forest conservation practices, including establishing set-asides within the private industry estates to conserve critical habitats and maintain important forest connectivity.

5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning

Baseline projects as well as other contributions to the project's baseline and co-financing are given in *UNDP Project Document Section IV (Results and Partnerships)* for each project component, and *Section IX (Financial Planning and Management)*.

The indicative co-financing for the project has been confirmed with a total of USD 62,330,965 (see Table C above). GEF resources will be used to address efforts in developing an enabling framework for integrated management of biological corridors in the country including legislation, policy and institutional mechanisms for conservation and resource management. This will be done through the provision of incremental funding to add on to investments already being made by project partners. The project preparation phase has also engaged stakeholders, developed a shared vision and initiated steps towards the removal of barriers for effective implementation. The project can therefore, be considered entirely incremental above the baseline situation.

6) Global Environmental Benefits

The GEF increment builds on the existing programs undertaken by the Government of Philippines for biodiversity conservation, maintaining ecosystem services, sustainable land and forest management. In the alternative scenario enabled by the GEF, the project will removal of systemic and institutional barriers for integrated biodiversity planning through (i) strengthened institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks that incorporate biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services considerations into sectoral and national land use planning, (ii) strengthened national capacity for biodiversity corridor level integrated land use planning with biodiversity mainstreamed, (iii) effective operationalization of an integrated planning and management approach in two biological corridors in the country with biodiversity compatible SLM, SFM and improved agricultural land restoration in place, (iv) an effective integrated biological corridor management supporting key ecosystem service (i.e. water) and biodiversity of global significance, (v) biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into the agricultural, tourism, forestry and mining sectors, supporting the reduction of key threats to globally and regionally threatened ecosystems and species, and (vi) knowledge management for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services, SLM, SFM and agricultural productivity is captured and shared, encouraging ongoing and widespread implementation. The proposed project also generates GEBs by contributing to Aichi Targets #5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 19.

The global benefits that will be delivered include improved management effectiveness of around 500,000 ha of protected areas (including existing PAs and other effective conservation measures or OECMs), improved agricultural productivity in around 15,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands, forest restoration in 15,000 ha of degraded forest lands and restoration of around 30,000 ha of critical biological habitats for generation of multiple benefits. Refer Table 1 below for GEB benefits:

Table 1: Global Environmental Benefits

Summary of Baseline Scenario	Summary of GEF Scenario	Global Environment Benefit
<i>Component 1: Effective coordination and governance framework for integrated biodiversity management in the Philippines biodiversity corridors system</i>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Philippines' globally significant habitats threatened by poor land use practices, climate change and over exploitation of natural resources · Development planning at national, regional, provincial and municipal levels does not fully account for ecosystem values and biodiversity, leading to continued loss of habitat and critical ecosystem functions · Gaps in legislation result in unabated threats to biodiversity as drivers of change accelerate within large biological landscapes · Limited capacity at national, regional, provincial and municipal levels level to lead on integrated landscape planning and management results in less efficient approaches to biodiversity corridor management · Regulatory frameworks and enforcement capacities to ensure compliance with conservation and sustainable development guidelines and regulations limited · Regulatory frameworks and enforcement capacities to ensure compliance with conservation and sustainable development guidelines and regulations limited and less effective in preventing negative development impacts, encroachment, and illegal hunting and consumption) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Strengthened policy and institutional framework for integrated management of biodiversity corridors · Improved partnership arrangements and cooperation for integrated planning and management of large biodiversity corridors · Strengthened application of policies and regulations on biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resources management within large biodiversity corridors · Improved approaches for mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem services into key sectors and into national, regional, provincial and municipal socio-economic planning · Enhanced capacity to implement decision-making tools to inform improved land use planning for biodiversity conservation outcomes, economic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services; · Capacity enhanced to carry out management planning, use of management standards and protocols for biodiversity corridors landscapes and demonstrates potential for PA contributions to socio-economic development and community livelihoods 	<p>BD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Improved management of biodiversity corridors covering around 600,000 ha, maintaining globally important biodiversity and ecosystem services · Improved conservation management in 11 existing PAs covering around 300,000 ha · 200,000 ha of additional important biodiversity areas effectively managed as OECMs to improve forest and habitat connectivity and enhance the viability of key species and ecosystems · Around 30,000 ha of critical ecosystems for threatened species restored · Populations of high priority endemic and/or threatened species remain stable or increase in targeted biodiversity corridors: <p>(i) <u>Central Mindoro</u>: Forest obligate species such as Tamaraw (<i>Bubalus mindorensis</i>); and Mindoro Bleeding heart pigeon (<i>Gallicolumba platanae</i>)</p> <p>(ii) <u>Eastern Mindanao</u>: Forest obligate species such as Mindanao Bleeding heart pigeon (<i>Gallicolumba crinigera</i>) and Philippine eagle (<i>Pithecophaga jefferyi</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increase in level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring of integrated biodiversity management planning in biodiversity corridors · At least 3 of RDIPs, 9 of PPFPs and 24 LGU CLUPS revised to full integrate biodiversity considerations from IEM framework and plans within the two biological corridors · Increased awareness of community members, government and sector agency staff, private sector and other stakeholders (disaggregated by sex and type of beneficiary) aware of and taking action to address potential conservation threats and their adverse impacts on biodiversity within biological landscapes
<p>Component 2: Application of network design and integrated management of biodiversity corridors to ensure continued stability and sustainability of their biological, ecosystem services and socio-economic conservation values</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management, and protected areas management is not fully integrated into regional, provincial and municipal socio-economic development plans and processes · Resource use management and planning does not take place at the corridor level or adequately take account of potential impacts on protected areas and biodiversity rich areas from production landscapes · Protected areas and other critical habitat areas outside protected areas are somewhat disconnected from each other · Information is not available to enable effective biodiversity monitoring or corridor planning / spatial zoning within large landscapes sites, or to measure and track the negative impacts of development, agricultural expansion, or other development processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Biodiversity conservation, sustainable management of land and forests, and PA management consolidated within biodiversity corridors and aligned with existing regional, provincial and municipal planning and management structures · Multi-stakeholder participation in biodiversity corridor decision-making strengthened · Integrated strategies in place for two biodiversity corridors · PA management strengthened and integrated into overall land and resource use planning frameworks in surrounding areas 	<p>LD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Around 15,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands restored to provide increased productivity and economic benefits to local communities · At least 65,000 persons composed of at least 50% women (of which 25% ip women) benefiting from improved land and agricultural management practices, improved livelihoods and small business development with 15% average increase in participating household incomes · In addition to the 15,000 ha of SLM supported under the project, there is expectation that mainstreaming of IEM approaches into regional and local planning systems will generate additional benefits in terms of an increase in program investment and budget allocation for 150,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands in the revised 24 CLUPs. <p>CC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · High conservation value forest areas conserved or increased leading to carbon sequestration of 17,503,045 tCO₂eq over 20 year period · Forest certification systems updated and adopted within the
<p><i>Component 3: Community-based sustainable use and management systems in the two pilot biodiversity corridor system in the Philippines</i></p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Development can lead to deforestation and degradation of native forest, threatening globally significant biodiversity and results in increasing land degradation, loss of ecosystem services, etc. · Tourism development does not fully address needs of local communities and channel adequate benefits to local communities · Some communities / residents within PAs rely on unsustainable resource uses (overharvesting of forest products; hunting; etc.) due to a lack of experience or knowhow on sustainable livelihood options and a lack of incentive mechanisms for sustainable resource use · Lack of business development plans to guide biodiversity-friendly agricultural and tourism, results in damaging practices that degrade biodiversity and ecosystem services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Forest landscapes restored in order to provide important habitat for species and functional connectivity · Biodiversity-friendly and revenue sharing standards for tourism development / operations for biodiversity corridors · Sustainable livelihoods activities benefiting local residents and reducing their negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning · Improved productivity and incomes from previously degraded agricultural lands · Degraded lands (including mined out areas) providing multiple benefits to local communities 	<p>corridors to improve forest conservation based on lessons from 3 sites including 2 community managed forest and one privately managed forest pilot and adopted by DENR and stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Around 15,000 ha of disturbed natural forests and restored providing biodiversity, ecosystem services and economic benefits · In addition to the 15,000 ha of SFM supported under the project, there is expectation that mainstreaming of IEM approaches into regional and local planning systems will generate additional benefits in terms of an increase in program investment and budget allocation for 150,000 ha of degraded forest lands in the revised 24 CLUPs.
<i>Component 4: Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming, learning and monitoring and evaluation</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Key stakeholders are unaware of the damaging impacts of their actions on fragile ecosystems and biodiversity, the economic implications of this degradation, regulations to protect them and the penalties for breaking these. · Information is not readily available to enable effective biodiversity monitoring within PAs sites, or to measure and track the negative impacts of development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increased awareness of stakeholders and local communities and broad support for PAs and recognition of their multiple benefits and contributions to local economies · Strengthened monitoring and reporting systems for PAs and their management effectiveness collated and reported at a national level · Enhancement of learning network for transmission of best practices and fit-for-purpose science. 	

7) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

Sustainability and Scaling Up

The project will address sustainability as follows:

Financial sustainability will be achieved through: (i) ensuring that through the integrated biodiversity management planning exercise for the corridors, the provincial, regional and municipal entities will facilitate the convergence of sub-national government financial resources to support conservation and sustainable community livelihoods that would help financially sustain activities beyond the life of the project; (ii) ensure a partnership arrangement between provincial, municipal, community, NGO and private sector partners within the biological corridors that will ensure complementarity and cost-effectiveness of multiple partners and investments; (iii) develop new business models for biological corridor conservation, livelihood and value chains that recognize the full range of environmental ecosystem services provided by biological corridors and their attendant ecosystems. Developing market linkages for sustainable forest and agriculture products and services, ecotourism and local handicrafts and establishment of “brand” labels will ensure financial sustainability of local livelihoods; (iv) support for establishment of Community level revolving funds that will help to financially sustain and expand investments beyond the project period; (v) facilitating market linkages, green certification of biological corridor products and services to improve sustainability and value addition; and (vi) training of local entrepreneurs and enterprises. Implementation of such models through carefully developed business plans could lead to a diversification of funding base from sources such as ecotourism, NTFPs and other mechanisms, when these becomes available.

Institutional sustainability will be improved through systematic capacity development of existing public institutions (particularly that of DENR, DA, NCIP, etc.), local government, networks of Indigenous People and civil society organizations and local community groups, and other relevant sectors in the biological corridors. By engaging these stakeholders in conservation and livelihood investment planning, the project will help establish alliances for conservation and sustainable use of biological corridor resources that is expected to continue beyond the project period. Capacity building measures will be improved by integrating these programs into the curricula of training institutes (including farmer field schools and locally-based agricultural schools). Carefully tailored training and capacity building to enhance the skills of local communities in relation to sustainable NTFP, SLM, SFM, ecotourism and other local producers will provide institutional sustainability. The project’s institutional arrangements will further help build coordination structures at the national and corridor level with representation from different development sectors and stakeholders (including sub-national government entities, NGOs and private sector) to implement joint biological corridor planning and to ensure that development plans mainstream biodiversity policies. To ensure sustainability of institutional arrangements for integrated biodiversity management planning and ensuring mainstreaming of biodiversity policies into socio-economic development plans, the Government of Philippines will work towards institutionalization of these coordination mechanisms as part of its long-term strategy to streamline and support biodiversity goals. Formalization of these coordination arrangements will enable sustaining and scaling up of benefits of the project in terms of integrated ecosystem management planning and biodiversity mainstreaming within the biological corridors.

Social sustainability will be improved through the development/strengthening of stakeholder participation mechanisms for the target biological corridors. A Knowledge Management and Communication strategy (Annex 6) has been developed to facilitate awareness and enhance stakeholder participation. The Participatory Framework for Integrated Ecosystem Management, Consensus Building and Planning and Implementation (Annex 10) was designed during PPG stage to ensure adequate consultation and participatory decision making to ensure that project activities are detailed in collaboration with local communities, so that extensive consultation including all affected groups is undertaken prior to delineation of areas to be set asides, so as to avoid excessive community resource use areas or to improve the management of such uses. Social sustainability will also be achieved by strengthening

of community institutions, ensuring their active participation in planning and implementation of conservation and sustainable natural resources management, improving community capacity for management of CCPs and for improving grievance redressal mechanisms that will ensure social sustainability.

Environmental sustainability will be achieved through a coordinated approach involving improved protected area management approaches, sustainable natural resources, forest and fisheries management, securing improved forest restoration and sustainable NTFP use, improving incentives for conservation and community participation. It would also help in reduction of external threats on PAs and wildlife through biological corridor level partnerships, will enhance controls on poaching, and improve inter-provincial collaboration. This work at biological corridors is aimed at ensuring environmental and socio-economic sustainability through improved institutional capacity, policies and legislation.

Potential for scaling up: The project is designed to provide demonstration models for up-scaling in the Philippines. In particular, the capacity building and the development of legislation, guidelines and regulations for each aspect of the project will strongly support up-scaling. Ensuring that activities, impacts and lessons learnt from the demonstration sites are disseminated widely helps generate a bottom-up demand for similar activities throughout the country. The Project's investment component will seek to develop synergies among rural development actors and programs with an objective of raising additional investments that will fund and expand models of resource use and alternative livelihood activities within and outside of the targeted biological corridors. The replication and scaling up strategy to be developed (Output 4.3) will assess sustainable financial and institutional arrangements for scaling up, support identification of new biological corridor sites, develop a best practice manual and conduct dissemination events to encourage uptake of IEM approaches in other sites. In particular activities to be undertaken as part of the effort of scaling up include the following:

- **Development of a replication strategy** based on lessons learned at the field level that will ensure that the integrated ecosystem management planning approach and models developed and pilot tested in the two biological corridors are scaled up to include all other biological corridors in the country. Output 4.3 would support the analysis, documentation and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned that deliver tangible improvements in biodiversity and natural resources status to provide examples for replication. It would also entail participation in regional and international workshops, conferences and field visits for national and provincial staff to improve learning and exchange of experiences in mainstreaming biodiversity considerations, and integrated ecosystem management planning and practices. Based on these best practices and lessons, the replication strategy will provide a basis for actions at other key biological corridors, identify required institutional and coordination arrangements resources and partnership commitments (including with NGOs), select interventions and potential sites for replication by the fifth year of the project.
- **Providing technical support to facilitate identification of new biological corridors and initiation of planning** for integrated approaches in other biological corridors;
- **Annual seminars** for key staff and decision makers on best practices, experiences and needs;
- **Financial mechanisms** identified to strengthen and upscale financial support to conservation and sustainable land use/natural resource management in biological corridors.
- **Publishing of best practice manuals/handbooks/compendiums** of integrated biodiversity management approaches; and
- **End of project national seminar** on outcomes and replication for IBM approaches in the Philippines

Innovation

The project design is innovative in several ways. First, it proposes to pilot the first programs in Philippines for integrated ecosystem planning and management planning and management in large landscapes and seascapes (or biological corridors). The project seeks to mainstream biodiversity conservation outcomes in sectoral and provincial economic planning. This approach, that would involve multi-stakeholder planning and an inter-sectoral coordination approach to biological corridor management in Philippines would propose the following approaches: (i) a biological corridor should be viewed as a system in itself, comprised of various natural, cultural and socio-economic components; in turn, it is part of the bigger national, regional, thematic, and global networks of biological corridors; (ii) biological corridors would be appropriately zoned by ecology-based planning using a patch-corridor-matrix model for biodiversity conservation, taking account of landscape ecology, inter-connectedness, vegetation zoning, regional land-use planning, nature and cultural landscape integration, etc. (i.e. landscape planning); (iii) bringing actors from the provinces, market and civil society sectors together to achieve mutual understanding and negotiate and implement mutually agreeable plans, combining top-down and bottom-up approaches and promotion of community participation (i.e. intersectoral coordination); and (iv) promoting a conservation-based economy in biological corridors, with value creation and increased economic benefits for local people; labeling of goods and services from biological corridors (e.g. tourism products and services; sustainable agricultural products; NTFPs, etc.); consumption and production in line with sustainable development; fair distribution; and awareness of conservation of nature and culture. Lessons learned on collaboration with the tourism and other sectors can be shared with other biological corridors and protected areas in the region. Secondly, it is innovative because it would seek to link “set-asides” and forest restoration as part of a larger effort to improve biodiversity conservation outcomes in HCVPs and KBAs and improve connectivity of individual parts of the larger biological corridor. Thirdly, it would serve as a pilot to develop and test sustainable financing mechanisms at the local level (community or village level) to improve incentive for community engagement in conservation, including establishment of local level revolving funds, tourism concession fees, accommodation surcharges, etc.).

Cost efficiency and effectiveness

The project has been designed to reflect the most cost-effective approach. A number of strategies were evaluated during the project formulation stage to identify those strategies and activities that demonstrate this cost-effective approach. The cost-effective approaches that have been applied to the project are the following:

Defining a holistic and integrated approach to project formulation: The project adopts an integrated biodiversity management approach that connects biologically rich landscape and seascapes and their various interactions to maximize opportunities for synergies, such that selected actions and interventions generate multiple benefits. This is accomplished through development and implementation of well-designed conservation actions (KBAs, HCVP open access forest management with tenure arrangements and ecosystem restoration) and community resource management and livelihood measures in agriculture, fisheries, non-timber forest products and tourism that incorporate mainstreamed biodiversity policies and best practices in terms of carbon sequestration, improved food security and more resilience to climate events, whilst improving livelihood benefits, biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services.

Sites were selected using a tiered-approach adopting a systematic and spatially explicit method that optimally captured the best multiple criteria-based choice of the project sites. The approach considered globally significant and nationally important species in identifying the sites to ensure their protection and better management.

Sequencing of activities: Project design and sequencing of project activities ensures that foundational activities are completed first, to the extent feasible, or in parallel, such as (i) establishing functional governance and coordinating mechanisms at the national and provincial levels; (ii) legislative and regulatory changes clarifying responsibilities of biological corridor IEM planning, management and oversight; legislative and regulatory changes to facilitate to mainstreaming biodiversity into sector and environmental planning; and (iii) capacity improvements are developed to provide the necessary groundwork for later demonstration of best practices in a limited number of biological corridors (2) under Outcomes 2 and 3. The project includes subsequent documentation, dissemination of best practices for scaling up under Outcome 4 and feedback mechanisms to influence further policy and legislative changes, as appropriate.

Models to demonstrate benefits: Project design ensures selectivity in the identification and development of on-the-ground demonstration investments (in Outcomes 2 and 3) so as to ensure cost-effectiveness in terms of avoiding duplication and ineffective spread of activities. Locating these mix of management and restoration activities in selected high value biodiversity areas or clusters within the biological corridors will help demonstrate tangible impacts on the ground rather than spreading activities widely and in a scattered manner throughout the biological corridors. It would also support demonstration of community revolving funds as a mechanism to ensure community participation and financing of investments, improve financial sustainability and long-term financial commitments for community livelihood activities, rather than have to depend on government hand-outs, thus empowering communities in the management of their own enterprises.

Building on existing lessons and best practices: As a measure to ensure cost-effectivity, project design focuses on use of available resource to the extent possible building on the existing PA management planning foundation, existing resource management plans, existing mechanisms for integration of biodiversity consideration into sub-national level planning and using NGOs that are already active in the area to support local level planning, capacity building and provision of implementation support. Rather than invest in extensive Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans that cannot be implemented without high levels of zoning and rural and urban land planning expertise, this project will invest in IEM plans that are specific to the biological corridors and narrower in its scope and reach. The process for IEM planning advocated here is both effective and cost-efficient. Rather than hire expensive external consultants, local planning teams consisting of NGOs and local government technical specialists will make use of available information and extensive stakeholder consultations to develop plans that follow the “No Regrets” principle adopted by national policies. This results in plans that have higher levels of participation and buy-in. It would also build and replicate lessons from REDD+, PES, GEF small grants program and other initiatives.

Data management systems: The project will focus on the development of standardized, but simple information collection and databases at biological corridor (including cost-effective GIS solutions) that is also a proven and effective way to collect and share data. The Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy in particular makes use of simple and effective local forms of communication.

Co-financing Cost-effectiveness: The total GEF investment of US\$ 12,260,241 for this project will leverage a minimum of US\$ 62,701,007 in cofinancing, a cost-effective ratio of 1:5.1 with additional associated financing inputs anticipated during project implementation.

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

NA

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

The project included a wide range of consultations during the PPG stage. Initial stakeholder analysis during the PIF stage was followed up with consultation during the PPG stage in terms of the design of the project. During the PPG stage, the stakeholder analysis was updated and elaborated (refer UNDP Project Document) following extensive consultations undertaken by The PPG Team at the biological corridor site and with the provincial and local governments addressing both institutional stakeholders in the context of their statutory involvement in the project, and more broadly for non-governmental stakeholders at the district, community and local levels including natural resource dependent communities. The PPG team conducted a number of field visits to discuss with various stakeholders, including local communities on their perceptions in relation to the project activities in the two biological corridors, their relationship with the forest and its natural resources and specific needs of the communities to improve their agricultural productivity, livelihoods and their potential role in the proposed project. Stakeholder consultations were conducted to obtain the perspective of the different stakeholders during the period July 2018 through February 2019. Following a series of Inception Workshops that was conducted through May and June, 2018 and stakeholder consultations in the two biological

corridors, and following extensive field work and further development of the project design, validation workshops at the biological corridor and national level were conducted in January 2019 to discuss the project design and reach general consensus on project outcomes, outputs, activities and institutional arrangements for the project (Refer Table 4 and Annex 31 of UNDP Project Document for the extensive list of consultations that were undertaken during the PPG stage and detailed stakeholder engagement approach). The list of stakeholders consulted has been downloaded in PIMS.

Table 2: Stakeholder Involvement Plan

Key Stakeholder	Role and responsibilities / mandate	Proposed role in the project and involvement mechanism
DENR HQ offices: > USEC /ASEC for Planning > Policy and Planning Services (PPS); > Human Resource Management Services (HRMS); > Knowledge and Information Services (KISS) > Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Service (FASPS) > Field Operations Office (including Asecs for Luzon and Mindanao Operations) > GEF Operational Focal Point/Usec for Climate Change	USEC/ASEC for PP: Executive oversight of integrated policy formulation /planning. PPS: Oversees overall planning and programming and review of policy initiatives. HRMS: Develop and manage overall HR capacity building program. KISS: Plan and oversee interventions for KM and information management. FASPS: Oversight for project management and monitoring. Field Operations: Supervision of all field related program implementation. GEF Operational Focal Point: monitoring and evaluation of GEF programs	USEC/ASEC for PP: Convene IEM /IBM consensus building among DENR bureaus and among corridor multi stakeholders. PPS: Serve as advocate for integrated approach to planning, coordination and monitoring by DENR subsectors along IEM principles & oversees policy review. HRMS and KISS: Incorporate IEM & IBM in HR capacity; and knowledge management initiatives. FASPS: Facilitate linkages with other ongoing and planned programmes and sharing of lessons from similar past or completed projects. Will also undertake overall coordination of implementation and M and E for DENR and reporting to oversight agencies. Field Operations: Facilitate synergy and mainstreaming in DENR wide program operations (cross sectoral); support sharing and lessons learning with other regions and sectors. GEF Operational Focal Point: Undertake portfolio level M and E; provide guidance and facilitate reporting to GEF.

Key Stakeholder	Role and responsibilities / mandate	Proposed role in the project and involvement mechanism
DENR Bureaus: > Biodiversity Mgt. Bureau (BMB) > Forest Mgt. Bureau (FMB) > Mines & Geosciences Bureau (MGB) > Environment Bureau (EMB) > Land Management Bureau (LMB) > River Basin Coordinating Office (RBCO) > Ecosystems Res. and Devpt. Bureau (ERDB)	BMB: Coordinate implementation of NBSAP and of the NIPAS. FMB: Oversees forest management and National Greening Program & Forestland Tenure instruments. MGB: Oversees the mining sector development. EMB: Oversee the EIA process. LMB: Oversees land administration programs. RBCO: Coordinates River Basins master planning. ERDB: Serve as DENR's ecosystems research arm.	Coordinated by USEC for Planning, all cited bureaus will be supported to incorporate BD corridor concerns in their respective subsector formulation of policy and standards and safeguards; national planning and implementation and technical assistance to LGUS and communities. BMB will serve as technical secretariat to Project Board and provide direct assistance to Corridor Councils through the R/DENR. Enter into MOAs with responsible partners for delivery of outputs. MGB: Will provide support in development/updating of policies to establish conservation areas within mining areas; and mainstreaming of BD in the management of mining companies' Sustainable Development and Management Plan (SDMPs); and other applicable policies and guidelines. EMB will support in review of EIA guidelines for extractive industries in BD Corridors. FMB will support in strengthening alignment of the FAO GEF Project <i>Enhancing Biodiversity, Maintaining Ecosystem Flows and Enhancing Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Management of Forest Resources and Restoration of Degraded Forestlands</i> with this Project, and in review of Forest Certification Systems, incorporation of BD concerns in CBFMAs, and other forestry programs. RBCO will participate actively to ensure congruence with RB Master Plans and Strategies, and in implementation of these in the BD Corridors. LMB will support in alignment of their land management and titling programs with the BD Corridor strategies in the two sites and in the rest of the corridors eventually. ERDB will support through provision of expertise and assistance in research agenda for the BD Corridors.
DENR Regional offices > R/DENR for IV-B, 11 and 13 > Regional offices of MGB > Regional office of EMB	Implement national DENR programs at regional, provincial and district levels. Provide direct technical support to LGUs, and other stakeholder organizations.	All DENR regional offices: Incorporate BD corridor concerns in their respective programs and support for LGUS/communities. R/DENR: Act as convener of the Biodiversity Corridor and cluster committees (together with PLGU concerned). Provide operational leadership of implementation at corridor level.

Key Stakeholder	Role and responsibilities / mandate	Proposed role in the project and involvement mechanism
Department of Agriculture > Policy & Planning Service Bureau of Soils and Water Management (BSWM) > Buresu of Agirculture and Fisheries Standards (BAFS) > Reg offices (IV-B, 11, 13)	DA develops and implements policies and programs for agricultural development. It also serves as the country focal point for land degradation neutrality and sustainable land management. Regional offices guide and enables LGUs implement devolved agricultural functions.	Policy and Planning Offices: Serve as PB member, oversee formulation of targeted policy instruments, and incorporation of BD corridor concerns in mid-term review of AFMA. DA-BSWM: Develop approaches for SLM and download to R/DA. BAFS: Complete recognition system for BD-friendly agriculture. Support LGU initiatives to include IP domains in OA programs. R/DA: Serve as core member of corridor /cluster committee, guide LGU in implementing BD friendly agriculture, and incorporate learning in DA strategic regional programs of work.
National Commission for Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) > National HQ > Regional Offices (including provincial & area offices) in IV-B, II, and I3	NCIP formulates and implements policies for the enhancement of IP welfare. It facilitates land security, ancestral domain planning and IKSP documentation and mandatory IP representation in governance.	National NCIP office: Serve as PB member and oversee preparation/updating of agreed upon policy instruments/ guidelines. R/NCIP: Serve as core member of corridor / cluster advisory committee, Facilitate interventions at Ancestral Domain levels (with supporting NGO) and factor learning in strategic regional program of work.
Reg Development Council (RDC) & NEDA > RDC- Economics Committee (RDC/EC) > RDC- IP Committee (RDC/IP) > NEDA Agricultgue and Nautural Resources Service > NEDA Reg Offices(NRO)	RDC Economics Committee and IP Committee: Reviews sectoral plans for agriculture and NRM and IP affairs among others. NEDA NROs: Serve as the secretariat of the Regional Development Council and oversees preparation of Regional Plans. ANRES: NEDA HQ focal office for Agriculture and ENR affairs.	NEDA NROs will support in mainstreaming of BD Corridor Strategic Plans with Regional Development Investment Programs; Regional Physical Framework Plans and Provincial Physical Framework Plans
Other key agencies such as DILG, DTI, DoT, DOST, DEPED, CHED	Regional Agencies involved in planning and implementation of sectoral programs in the corridors particularly on local governance, trade & industry; Science and Technology, Education and Tertiary education	Their participation would be crucial in the formulation of the IEM framework, and in ensuring that their programs are aligned.

Key Stakeholder	Role and responsibilities / mandate	Proposed role in the project and involvement mechanism
Department of Interior and local government (DILG) > Provincial, Municipal LGUs	DILG: Supervises /capacitates LGUs implement mandates. LGUs: Formulate and implement local policies /programs following the Philippines Development Plan (PDP).	DILG: Together with DENR review and update ENR guidelines for LGUs (incorporating incentives and capacity building). LGUs: Co- convene and serve as core members of corridor/cluster committee and plan and implement agreed upon priorities in respective areas.
National and local NGOs Such as Conservation International (CI), Haribon Foundation, Center for Conservation Innovations (CCI), Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation Incorporated (PBCFI), Phil Association for Indigenous Peoples Development (PAFID), xxx ANTHOWATCH, PANLIPI, RARE Philippines, Philippine Eagle Foundation (PEF), Mindoro Island Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc. etc. etc.	These NGOs have ongoing activities in the project sites and have active partnership with BMB in advocacy, national PA system planning, monitoring and management. They undertake technical studies to provide scientific basis for establishment and better management of PAs and conservation areas; and in engagement with local stakeholders in addressing threats to BD loss.	These NGOs are expected to work with the DENR and corridor/cluster committees to ensure the best partnership arrangements of communities in their areas with the project. The DENR will execute MOAs with these groups to assume responsibilities for the implementation of defined activities in each site.
NGO networks and grant funding mechanisms such as Forest Foundation of the Philippines (FFP) and Foundation for Philippine Environment (FPE)	They support initiatives of local communities in sustainable management of natural resources in KBAs within the corridors.	They will be engaged to provide co-financing to support activities of local communities and local NGOs in implementation of identified priority actions to address threats to biodiversity consistent with the agreed upon framework.
Indigenous peoples such as IP networks and local communities (farmers engaged in agriculture, upland forestry, and other economic activities in the corridor)	They are the direct and primary stakeholders in the Project. They stand to benefit from the Project and suffer the consequences of environmental degradation in the corridor. IP communities have strong historical and cultural ties to their domains, which coincide with existing PAs and potential conservation areas. Their indigenous practices and knowledge systems are mainly consistent with conservation objectives. Some communities are engaged in unsustainable practices, while some are already engaged in conservation activities in their farms. Some would have secure tenure while others may have no secure tenure yet.	IP communities will be supported in the preparation of ADSDPPs identification and mapping of ICCAs, and that are consistent with the corridor framework. A representative of national IP Federation will be selected to be a member of the Project Board. Together with IP communities, local communities will be the Project's target in terms of incentives, information and extension campaigns, and promotion of sustainable agriculture and biodiversity-friendly livelihood practices. The Project will also enter into partnerships with organized communities to influence their farm planning and management practices to ensure consistency with the IEM framework.
Women and youth	They are generally a neglected group in the management structures and decision making at the community level. However, they have a lot of potentials to contribute to changing practices and attitudes particularly from those that lead to excessive utilization of natural resources.	They will be provided with ample opportunity to take part in the formulation of the project. They will provide their special perspective to the preparation team so that their potential can be harnessed during implementation. Furthermore, their concerns will be fully considered in management planning.

Key Stakeholder	Role and responsibilities / mandate	Proposed role in the project and involvement mechanism
Academic and Research Institutions	They undertake research and other advocacy activities in the regions/provinces where the corridors are located.	They will advise on the necessary research and other studies and in sharing of scientific information on the sites. The Project will enter into MOA with these organizations to carry out baselines and long-term monitoring of changes and impacts on the corridor.
Private sector such as: holders of industrial forest management agreements, investors in ecotourism, mining operators, etc. Business associations and Partnership initiatives for green business and corporate reforms such as the EITI	Most companies have policies on corporate social responsibility that can potentially support direct conservation efforts. Their actions directly impact on use of biodiversity resources.	The Project will engage actively with the private sector to explore potential investment opportunities to support BD friendly enterprises based on the corridor framework. Selected mining firms will be engaged to voluntarily apply updated biodiversity conservation protocols.
Development partners such as: ADB, World Bank, GIZ, USAID etc.	They have ongoing and planned initiatives in the sector. They engage in active dialogue with BMB and DENR in assessing overall sector performance, and in defining areas of future support.	The project preparation team will ensure that there is synergy with other Projects, and that all initiatives are consistent with the overall strategic directions and policy framework.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

X Consulted only;

X Member of Advisory Body; contractor;

Co-financier;

X Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

X Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

Documents

Title

Submitted

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only; Yes

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes

Executor or co-executor; Yes

Other (Please explain)

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

Women are directly engaged in agriculture and natural resources management, particularly among local communities in the corridors. They are expected to significantly influence current practices, and can be effective community advocates of sustainable natural resources management strategies. Among IP communities, there are clear roles for women as leaders, resource managers, trainers of the youth, and peacemakers. Among farming and fishing communities, women make important decisions regarding production, and have vital roles in marketing of the produce, allocation of domestic resources and harvests. As nurturers of families, women are most directly affected by resource degradation or drastic changes in natural resources productivity.

In the Philippines, earlier gender analysis done by the Department of Environment (DENR) and the Philippine Commission on Women (PCW) in ENR sector revealed inequalities in status and condition of women and men in different areas and are manifested in the following:

- Norms, attitudes, and institutions that limit women's and men's life options
- Women's limited access to land and natural resources

- Low participation of women in governance and decision-making processes and in project activities
- Gender-role stereotyping and women's multiple burdens and various forms of violence against women and girls
- Unequal access to resources and services to improve their productive and reproductive work
- Limited access to education and health services

In this regard, this project will seek to understand and expose gender-differentiated biodiversity practices, gendered knowledge acquisition and usage of, as well as gender inequalities in control over resources in selected biodiversity corridor sites in Regions XIII (CARAGA), XI (Davao), and IV-B (Oriental and Occidental Mindoro), which will inform policies regarding biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and the sharing of its benefits. It will also consider the influences of gender differences and inequalities on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and the ways in which these differences and inequalities influence how women and men in selected sites are affected by biodiversity policies, planning and programming.

The direct beneficiaries will be at least 65,000 individuals belonging to 15,000 households (at least 50% of beneficiaries are women) who will benefit from four inter-related components of the project. Likewise, the project will support 24 Municipalities in selected locations that are expected to benefit from capacity building programs under this project.

A screening of the UNDP social and environmental screening (SESP) revealed a potential risk related to gender: "Project potentially may limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services while also facing potential of having adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls". This risk will be managed through the project. A gender analysis was undertaken at PPG stage to determine the differentiated roles of women and men in biodiversity conservation and natural resources management, the impacts of biodiversity loss and resource degradation on women, and their potential role in reversing these trends. The results have been used to develop gender-responsive project interventions including sex-disaggregated indicators, that will become the basis for monitoring and evaluation of the Project's impact on promoting gender equality and empowerment of women and youth including through the application of the UNDP gender maker. In addition, this gender assessment will also identify areas where negative impacts can be reduced and positive ones enhanced. During the implementation period, the project will ensure equal opportunities for women and men to participate in decision making. Steps will be taken to ensure that women's needs and interests are taken into account in management arrangements set up by the community, including encouraging women (particularly IP and rural women) to actively participate in community meetings and platforms that discuss project activities. In addition, gender and social inclusion considerations have been integrated into the project design (under Output 4.1).

Gender mainstreaming action plan (with quantifiable targets) for the project is provided in Annex 4 of the UNDP Project Document. A summary of key actions is provided below:

Ensure that project materials, including meeting agendas, reporting templates, communications materials, and all written policies include gender and social mainstreaming.

Create and require minimum standards for planning teams, including representation from multiple gender and social groups and/or tasking of planning team members to speak for vulnerable peoples.

Capacity building and training for project staff and planning team facilitators to include the input of multiple groups into resulting plans.

Support research and mapping of: (i) current gender roles and how they have changed between generations in each of the development sectors (agriculture, NTFP collection, grazing, and tourism, etc.); (ii) gender and social group uses and use patterns of land habitats; (iii) market access by gender; (iv) mapping of the tourism sector by gender and social group; and (vi) applying a gender and socially inclusive lens to all research plans and priorities to ensure that multiple groups' data needs are filled.

Invest in staff to enable adequate connections with multiple groups. Instead of general community meetings, meetings with (i) women's groups; (ii) men's groups; (iii) youth groups; and (iv) individuals with access to or influence over vulnerable people (e.g. IP leaders, landowners, or church leaders).

Capacity building and training for project staff and planning team facilitators to better engage multiple gender and social groups.

Apply a gender and socially inclusive lens to every meeting, report, plan, and activity.

Apply sex disaggregated targets and baselines where appropriate, as part of project monitoring plan.

Conduct economic and social analyses of proposed land and forest plans resulting from the project, and all other outputs (such as proposed protected areas and implementation plans for best practices).

Implement the Communications Strategy, including: holding multiple, targeted meetings by disaggregated groups.

Make better use of digital platforms in order to create oral/audio content, with less emphasis on writing to better communicate with IP groups, rural women, farmers, and youth.

Incorporate gender and socially-sensitive indicators and collect sex disaggregated data for monitoring and evaluating project results.

Recruitment of gender specialist to facilitate the implementation and monitoring of the gender plans and for capacity building and training of key implementing agency staff.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

X closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

X improving women's participation and decision making; and or

X generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? (yes X)

Documents

Title

Submitted

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Will the project’s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being, achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. when impact is rated as 5, and when impact is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

Table 3: Project Risk and Mitigation Matrix

Project risks					
A. General Risks					
Description	Type	Impact, Probability and Risk Level	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status

<p>Risk 1 - Agencies will fail to agree on the IEM framework as basis for integrated planning, management and implementation of programs in the corridor. The inherent conflicts in policies and orientation of mandates and programs will make it difficult for agency representatives to be flexible in their interpretation, thus hindering them to agree to a re orientation of their planning and management frameworks.</p>	<p>Institutional</p>	<p>I =1, P=2 Low</p>	<p>The Project will undertake studies to demonstrate the interrelationships and cross-sectoral impacts of various programs on the ability of the corridor to sustainably deliver ecosystem goods and services. The study will involve the active participation of agency staff at the central and field levels in each of the corridors to engender ownership and joint analyses of results. The Project will use this information to make the case for a multisectoral approach to deliver sustainable benefits. There have been examples of interagency cooperation towards common objectives. These mechanisms shall be explored to achieve convergence of agency programs based on mutually agreed strategies. The Project will progressively work towards this institutional set up, and will find existing mechanisms as venues for corridor level coordination of efforts. Such arrangements will be a product of the processes to be undertaken under the Project rather than as a precondition to implementation. Efforts will be made by the Project to make the case for greater cooperation by demonstrating the added benefits of doing so, rather than the traditional independent approach to natural resources management and BD conservation.</p>	<p>NPD, DENR</p>	<p>Implementation phase</p>
---	----------------------	--------------------------	--	----------------------	-----------------------------

Risk 2. It will take time for inherent resource conflicts to be resolved which could delay Project start up and progress. In many of these resource rich areas, the reality on the ground is that administrative failures, fragmented mapping, absence of coherent management framework, have brought about overlaps in community tenure and long term commercial leases on public lands.	Socio-political	I- 3 P- 3 Moderate	The Project duration is proposed to be 6 years to account for time for negotiations and settlement of resource use conflicts. Nonetheless, the essence of the Project is really to minimize such ‘conflicts’ and ensure synergy by developing a common framework for BD corridor management that is based on sufficient information, system of incentives, and mechanisms for resolving inconsistencies in natural resources use.	NPD DENR	Implementation phase
Risk 3: Long gestation periods for alternative livelihoods, and restoration of forest resources can undermine community participation	Social-Political	I-3 P-2 Moderate	Cluster Conservation Plan activities will entail a menu of options (including activities with short-term gestation periods as buffer until longer-term investments generate sustainable benefits) to help diversify the livelihood and resource base, including linkage with on-going governmental and NGO programs to supplement and complement project activities. The project will also seek to identify additional options (PES, REDD+) as means to improve incentives for local people	NPD DENR	Implementation phase
Risk 4 – Financial sustainability of BCs beyond the duration of the project is not ensured	Institutional	I-3 P-3 Moderate	The prevailing limited capacity on benefits from conserving ecosystem services to the economy and livelihoods, and continued Government primary focus on economic development results in financing for biodiversity conservation remaining significantly lower than their needs. Output 4.3 of the project entails the preparation of a sustainability plan for promotion of biodiversity conservation in biological corridors that would entail a number of key actions to guarantee financial sustainability.	NPD DENR	Implementation phase

Risk 5 – Security in some selected sites	Political	I-3 P-3 Moderate	Some sites are located within areas that are reported to have had security issues before in terms of military activities and the presence of armed groups from 2 or three rebel organizations. All field activities of the project will follow standard health and safety regulation set by both DENR and UNDP. This will involve securing mandatory security checks, clearances and coordination with local and provincial law enforcement authorities.	GOP	Implementation phase
B. Social and Environmental Risks					

<p>Risk 6. The two corridors have resource conflicts within PAs (e.g. within ancestral domain/CATC/CATD; ICCA; LCA) that could be exacerbated if the activities are not well implemented</p>	<p>Socio-political</p>	<p>I- 3 P- 3 Moderate</p>	<p>(i) At the PPG stage, a master list of clusters, geopolitical jurisdiction, coverage of protected areas and ancestral domains was prepared to serve as a guide for the PMU so that “conflicts” are minimized (Annex 6).</p> <p>(ii) A Participatory Framework for IEM, Consensus Building and Planning and Implementation (Annex 3) will be applied to ensure that community (including IP) concerns are addressed in a timely and efficient manner using FPIC procedures as defined by NCIP AO 1</p> <p>(ii) A screening checklist based on the SESP that will be developed early in project implementation (to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles and is sustainable;</p> <p>(iv) The project grievance redressal system (refer Section IV, Part iii of UNDP Project Document) provides a mechanism to address any specific community concerns and resolve conflicts.</p> <p>(v) An Indigenous Peoples’ Strategy (Annex 16) prepared at the PPG stage has mapped out existing resource conflicts in potential pilot ancestral domains and this will be updated as the project implementation progresses.</p>	<p>NPD</p>	<p>Implementation phase</p>
---	------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	------------	-----------------------------

<p>Risk 7: Development interventions (e.g. MSMEs, eco-tourism etc.) can have adverse impacts on species and habitats if not well implemented.</p>	<p>Environmental</p>	<p>I-3 P-2 Moderate</p>	<p>(i) The criteria for the selection of clusters (Annex 6) for intervention, conformed to the project's objective of 'enhancing the conservation of biodiversity through mainstreaming of biodiversity into planning policies and practices into Philippine's biodiversity landscapes.</p> <p>(ii) All community agriculture and production systems and livelihood activities will take place outside the key biodiversity areas through appropriate zoning arrangements.</p> <p>(iii) The Preparation of a screening checklist developed using SESP will be applied to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles</p> <p>(iv) Setting acceptable sustainable limits on harvest of non-timber forest products based on status and health of such populations and establishment of monitoring protocols.</p>	<p>NPD</p>	<p>Implementation phase</p>
--	----------------------	-----------------------------	--	------------	-----------------------------

<p>Risk 8: Improved zoning of the corridors for multiple different uses, community human rights, including access may be restricted in twelve clusters of the two biodiversity corridors in Eastern Mindanao and Mindoro. This will include indigenous communities located in ancestral domain areas, and CADCs/CADTs.</p>	Social	<p>I-3 P-3 Moderate</p>	<p>(i) Apply the Framework for IEM (Annex 3) to ensure that project activities are detailed in collaboration with Provincial and Municipal governments and local communities, to delineate areas to be set asides in a manner to avoid limitations on existing community resource use rights and access;</p> <p>(ii) The establishment of KBAs, HCVFs (refer Annex 6) that will be planned and managed under community governance mechanisms will take into consideration current uses of these resources</p> <p>(iii) The development and use of a screening checklist for project investments based on SESP to screen all investments;</p> <p>(iv) Project planning will ensure that decisions regarding restrictions, if any, on resource use will not be imposed, but will involve through an informed, transparent and consultative community consensus building process (refer Annex 6), and any restrictions, if any will be adequately compensated to match or exceed loss of incomes or livelihoods. An alternative livelihood development plan will be prepared early in project implementation (Year 1) for any households that are likely to be denied access to resources or current livelihood practice and</p> <p>(v) The project grievance redressal system (refer Section IV, Part iii of UNDP Project Document) provides a mechanism to address any specific community concerns.</p> <p>(vi) Use of FPIC procedures patterned after NCIP AO No. 1 to ensure consent regarding project investments</p>	NPD	Implementation phase
---	--------	-----------------------------	---	-----	----------------------

<p>Risk 9: The project could possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources of marginalized groups and indigenous people</p>	<p>Social</p>	<p>I – 3 P – 3 Moderate</p>	<p>(i). The Implementation of participatory IEM planning processes (Annex 3) to ensure that consultations and feasibility studies, particular related to lands claimed by IP community is carried out early project implementation to ensure that effective consultation takes place and community consent based on FPIC procedures prior to deciding on specific location, nature and scope of project investments. under ancestral domains.</p> <p>(ii) MoUs will be agreed to between the IP communities and project proponents on project investments before activities are implemented on the ground.</p> <p>(III) Engagement of parties through under the Grievance Redressal System to address any conflict between the government/municipal entities and IPs.</p> <p>(iv) Use of project screening checklist based on SESP to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles, and in particular do not conflict with IP community resource uses.</p> <p>(iv) Preparation of an Indigenous Peoples Plan (Annex 16) at the PPG stage addresses specific concerns relating to IPs, including tenure issues.</p>	<p>NPD</p>	<p>Implementation phase</p>
---	---------------	---------------------------------	---	------------	-----------------------------

<p>Risk 10: Women (IP and rural women in particular) and other marginalized groups may not be fully involved in planning, implementation and monitoring of project interventions and getting benefits from such initiatives, rather influential leaders and/or groups at the local level may have more control on local level decision making.</p>	<p>Social</p>	<p>I-3 P-2 Moderate</p>	<p>(i). A number of extensive consultations were held during the PPG stage to access the level of participation of women in the implementation phase of the project and to design measures to ensure their active participation in all stages of the project.</p> <p>(ii) The “<i>Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Action Plan</i>” (Annex 13) discusses how perspectives, rights, and interests of men and women are addressed will be applied to ensure that the project contributes to gender equality and creates equitable opportunities for women and men</p> <p>(iii) A gender and socially inclusive lens will be applied to every project activity and output to further analyze impacts on the rights of women and vulnerable peoples.</p> <p>(iv) Special investments would be planned based on women’s requirements.</p> <p>(v) A series of capacity building programs would be conducted to enhance the capacity of women and vulnerable members to take an active part in the planning and decision making process at the corridor/cluster level.</p> <p>(vi) At the program and project level implementation arrangements, a Gender Specialist will be posted at the Project Management Unit.</p> <p>(vii) Monitoring Plan has gender responsive indicators to access gender dimensions, including that the project scores a Gender Scorecard 2 Marker.</p>		
---	---------------	-----------------------------	---	--	--

<p>Risk 11 Natural disasters and climate change may affect the implementation and results of project initiatives</p>	<p>Environmental</p>	<p>I – 3 P – 3 Moderate</p>	<p>(i). The Implementation of participatory planning processes for IEM (Annex 3) will be carried out ensuring that activities are environmentally sustainable and supporting best practices managed for their climate risks.</p> <p>(ii). Enhanced Protected Areas management, Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Efforts (OECMs) and conservation practices would improve protection and management of critical ecosystems services which should help to increase the overall resilience of the natural systems.</p> <p>(iii) In terms of the Monitoring Plan, the condition of the natural ecosystems would be monitored to ensure that activities do not damage these sensitive ecosystems</p> <p>(iv). The KM and Communications Strategy (Annex 12) is a key framework to improve awareness of climate and ensuring measures to improve climate resilience</p>	<p>NPD</p>	<p>Implementation phase</p>
---	----------------------	---------------------------------	--	------------	-----------------------------

Risk 12 – Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) has not yet been secured	Institutional/Political	I - 3 P – 3 Moderate	<p>(i) Use of NCIP AO No. 1 or the FPIC Guidelines of 2006 as means to obtain consent.</p> <p>(ii) The Implementation of participatory planning processes for IEM (Annex 3) to ensure that consultations and feasibility studies, particularly related to lands claimed by IP community is carried out early project implementation to ensure that FPIC procedures are applied</p> <p>(iii) MoUs will be agreed through an open and free dialogue between the IP communities and project proponents on project investments before activities are implemented on the ground</p> <p>(v) Engagement of parties through under the Grievance Redressal System to address any conflict between the government/municipal entities and in particular to ensure that there is FPIC before project activities and their locations are decided on.</p>	NPD	Implementation phase
Risk 13 – The cultural identity of the IP might not be respected and/or IP knowledge (or other forms of cultural heritage) might be inadvertently harmed during project activities that intend to preserve and/or utilize it.	Political	I-3 P-3 Moderate	<p>(i) The use of the IP Plan prepared during the PPG stage of the project will form the basis for dealing with the interests of the IPs</p> <p>(ii) The effective use of the grievance redressal system Section IV, Part iv) to address these specific concerns;</p> <p>(iii) The use of a screening checklist based on SESP to screen all investments from an environmental, social and cultural perspective</p> <p>(iv) Any project related economic development initiatives proposed by IP communities will rest on the maintenance of the integrity of IP culture and defined through the use of FPIC procedures</p>	NPD	Implementation phase

The Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) was followed during project preparation, as required by the SESP Guidance Note of the UNDP. Accordingly, the social and environmental sustainability of project activities is in compliance with the SESP for the project (see Annex 3 of UNDP Project Document). The SESP identified high social (particularly as there are IPs in the project areas) and environmental risks for this project that would have potential negative impacts in the absence of safeguards. To avoid any potential for any likely impacts, the project will ensure social and environmental screening of all proposed investments to determine if there are any impacts. If the impacts are considered significant or cannot be managed by simple and practical mitigation measures that can be implemented within the capacity of the communities, these activities will be avoided. When impacts are easily manageable, the PMU would include responsibilities for ensuring oversight for these measures and monitoring of its implementation. Annually supervision missions will assess the extent to which the risks have been identified and managed. Overall, the project is expected to result in positive impacts for biodiversity conservation and socio-economic benefits through the greater participation of local communities in biodiversity corridor management processes, sustainable use of forest and resources, and improved natural resources based livelihood activities.

Specific efforts will be made while evaluating the condition of resources that will be used in livelihood and value chain programs to ensure that extraction is permissible within sustainable limits. Harvest of non-timber forest products (such as abaca, rattan, nito, medicinal plants and other products) that are currently practiced will follow ecologically friendly and sustainable practices. The project will ensure defining specific areas and harvest rates on the basis of good practice criteria backed by scientific information and close monitoring. The project will not support employment or livelihoods interventions that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals or to biodiversity and ecosystem functions. While the project will not propose any temporary or permanent physical displacement, nor will there be the need for land acquisition or access restrictions, in cases where this is unavoidable, the project will prepare a Livelihood Action Plan for affected households to ensure that this risk is effectively managed and affected households have access to similar or better land and livelihood options.

Any restrictions on access to and use of natural resources would not be imposed by the project proponents, but would evolve through a collective decision-making process amongst the community members and be supported by alternative livelihood and resource measures that adequately compensate for any loss of income or resources. Grievance redress mechanisms will facilitate the resolution of any conflict related to resource use and access. An Indigenous People's Framework has been developed that provides guidance for preparation of an IP Plan during early project implementation for ensuring that Indigenous peoples and vulnerable groups (such as IP and rural women) are fully involved in decision-making in terms of resource use, livelihood and income generation investments and conservation action. The project will support the recruitment of IP consultants to help develop and monitor the application of FPIC principles, preparation of the IP plan, undertake social assessments in IP areas and train and sensitize staff in the application of FPIC principles and practices. Specific institutional and administrative arrangements have been defined that encourages active participation of all households in a village and capacity building programs. For further information on social and environmental aspects and management measures refer UNDP SESP in Annex 3 and IP Strategy (see Annex 15). A screening checklist will be developed based on the SESP during early project implementation to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles. Project proponents will apply FPICs as discussed in the Indigenous Peoples' Plan as the basis for involvement of IPs in project related activities.

In line with UNDP standard procedures, the Project will set up and manage a **grievance redress mechanism** (GRM) as recommended by UNDP (2014) that would address project affected persons' (PAP) grievances, complaints, and suggestions. The GRM will be managed and regularly monitored by the RPMUs and NPMU.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The project will be implemented following UNDP's national implementation modality, according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Philippines, and the Country Program.

The **Implementing Partner** for this project is the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

The **Project Board** (PB) The Project will provide overall direction and oversight in the delivery of project outcomes. The PB will be composed of representatives from the following agencies: DENR, NEDA, DA, NCIP, DILG, HLURB, a representative of IP Federation, League of Provinces of the Philippines (LPP) the Business Sector and UNDP^[1], and will be chaired by a DENR Sub Cabinet Official. Specific tasks of the PB include the following:

The PB shall perform the following tasks: (i) formulate and submit overall plan and annual plans for the project implementation; (ii) prepare and carry out the actual project implementation; (iii) carry out activities related to bidding, contract management; (iv) budget management, perform financial and asset management of the project; (v) monitor and assess the implementation of the project activities; (vi) prepare the acceptance and transfer of the results of the project after completion, finish audit works, transfer assets of the project, prepare the terminal report and financial statement of the project, follow regulations on project closeout as per UNDP-GEF procedures; (vii) perform other tasks as necessary for the project.

The PB will be responsible for resources mobilization, including human resources, planning and implementation of project activities, will provide mechanisms and technical inputs necessary to integrate the results of various activities, will ensure satisfactory performance of the project members and contractors, and will provide official reports as needed

National Project Director: The **National Project Director** (NPD) is the designated representative of DENR. He/she will head the NPMU and will be accountable to DENR for the use of project resources and to deliver on outcomes. The NPD will manage the implementation of all project activities and will work closely with all partner institutions to link the project with complementary national programs and initiatives. The NPD is accountable to DENR and the PB for the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of the project intervention implementation, as well as for the use of resources. The NPD will be technically supported by contracted national and international consultants and service providers. Recruitment of specialist services for the project will be done by the NPD, in consultation with UNDP and DENR. The NPD will not be paid by the project, but will represent a government in kind contribution to the project. The NPD will be supported by a Deputy Project Director, who will also be a senior government staff.

National Project Manager (NPM): will be assigned with responsibility to support NPD in technical aspects of the project, provide direct guidance to project management unit to achieve project results/targets. .

National Project Management Unit (NPMU) consisting of a Project Director and Deputy Project Director (both will be senior officers from DENR), National Project Manager (NPM), National Planning and M&E Officer, Stakeholder engagement/gender specialist, KM specialist, IEC Specialist, PPP specialist and Finance/Administrative Assistant. This team will assist the PB to run the project on a day-to-day basis. The functioning of PMU will end when the final project Terminal Evaluation report and corresponding management response, and other documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project).

In addition, the project will set up Corridor Management Units in each of the two corridors. Each unit will consist of a Regional Project Director and a Regional Project Co-Director (both representing Regional Offices of DENR), Site/Corridor Manager, Regional Landscape Planning and M&E Officer and Finance/Administrative Assistant. The Corridor Advisory Committee will be chaired by the Deputy NPD/DENR Regional Director and include representatives from other key regional agencies, Key LGUs and the Indigenous Peoples Mandatory Representative (IPMR).

Project Assurance will be undertaken by the UNDP Program Officer responsible for the project based in the UNDP CO. The UNDP Program Officer will also act as a focal point of UNDP CO in facilitating and monitoring the project implementation. He/she will maintain a continuous partnership with the project team and participates in all project reviews, work/budget planning meetings, monitoring visits and evaluations. She/he will certify the annual and quarterly work-plan/budgets/progress reports, as well as proposed use of unspecified budget within the annual budget already approved for the project.

Coordination with other projects: The proposed project will coordinate with several government programs and specific projects associated with them to generate positive results through combined action (where appropriate) and to share lessons learned and best practices. The key national environment and natural resources management agencies whose programs will be coordinated with the project include the DENR and its respective Bureaus and also include the NCIP. These are detailed in Section VIII (Governance and Management Arrangements and in Annex 2 of the UNDP Project Document.

Role of Non-Governmental Organizations: Institutional arrangements for planning and implementation of cluster conservation plans (Output 2.2) will entail the competitive selection of a local NGO for each cluster. Contracted NGOs and local government (LGUs) will be responsible for *engaging local community, private sector entities, farmer organizations and IP members in the planning exercise* leading to the development of CCPs, for overseeing implementation of the CCPs, and for building and maintaining cluster-level linkages at the biodiversity corridor level to ensure wider ecosystem management. NGO activities supporting communities will be done collaboratively with LGUs. The selected NGO would have expertise in conservation, SLM, SFM, livelihood and enterprise development, social mobilization and tenure applications. Planning and implementation teams at the cluster level will include the above-mentioned expertise from the NGO, and incorporate key technical staff from the LGU in its area of operation, the latter inclusion in the planning and implementation activities will facilitate later integration of biodiversity consideration into the LGU CLUPs. Criteria for engagement of NGOs will be further reviewed and finalized during the launch workshop. Criteria for engagement of communities could include the following:

- Local strategic presence in the target area so that there will be a long term commitment to these communities and the objectives of the project;
- Good understanding of local government functioning and linkages to enable opportunities for integration of mainstreaming actions in CLUP planning processes;
- Demonstrated experiences in ability to nurture communities and establish business partnership for improving community productive resources and livelihood development;

- Experiences in working on conservation, SLM, SFM, livelihood and small scale enterprise development
- Experience in establishing community financial support mechanisms for sustainability
- Practices knowledge management and experience facilitation of consensus building processes; and

Ability to mobilize additional financial resources and financial track record.

[1] The representative of the IP groups will be identified through a vetting process with the National IP Federation, the federations at the corridor level and NCIP.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The socio-economic benefits in the project will be seen at the individual level and well as at the level of collective community level which means that changes at the households' level and also in economic groups like agriculturists, self-help groups, producer groups and cooperatives will be there in the following manner:

- At least 65,000 persons in target clusters in the two biodiversity corridors will directly benefit through improved livelihoods and incomes (15% increase), of which an estimated 50% would be women.
- As a result of initiatives on participatory integrated ecosystem management processes about significant additional people, living in and around the two corridors will indirectly benefit from improved management of the biodiversity corridors and the sustainable management of natural resources within.
- Implementation of integrated ecosystem management strategies and mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in sectoral and national, provincial and municipal economic development planning will result into improved and sustainable agriculture, better water conservation and management and improved livelihood and value chain products and services. This will collectively result in better conservation and livelihoods outcomes;
- Improved access to basic goods and technical services, technology and improved agricultural, forestry and tourism practices - a shift from extensive low nutrition productive systems to semi-intensive high nutrition ones, as well as the complementary diversification of livelihoods in agriculture and non-farm sector including tourism and agri-based products will ensure more livelihood options and better prices and income.
- An increase in community incomes from sustainable livelihood activities (calculated for each community) of around 15% wherein around 50% of beneficiaries will be women;

- The focus on addressing gender inequality wherein various initiatives such as technological interventions for drudgery reduction in livelihood and household based activities, promotion of alternative livelihood options, participation of women in various local conservation committees are proposed. The project envisages more gender equality in context of sex ratio, decision making powers, ownership and control on resources, reduction in drudgery as well as working hours of women and women leadership as well as participation.;
- A reduction in the natural resource conflicts and increase in effective implementation of sustainable practices. There will be at least 10 such additional practices that would be forthcoming from the project for potential replication within and outside the participating landscapes;
- Incremental funding from existing government and local development programs and also linkage with various banks for microfinance will improve sustainable natural resource outcomes and improved and diversified livelihoods and incomes and a sustainability of such investments beyond the life of the project; and

Stable or improved populations of key endangered species and improved forest and marine environments will greatly enhance visitor experiences.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user- friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Knowledge management is included under Component 4, predominantly Outputs 4.1 and 4.3. A knowledge management and communication plan will be developed at the beginning of the project (based on Annex 6 of the UNDP Project Document) to achieve the overall goal of creating linkages between the stakeholders from the municipal, provincial, regional and national level, for information, exchange of ideas and implementation of community-based conservation and sustainable forestry and land management and tourism activities. The knowledge management and communication plan is intended to ensure that: (i) the project is well understood, accepted, and implemented effectively and equitably; (ii) knowledge and lessons learned from the implementation process of this project are captured, documented and used to improve current and future project practices; (iii) understanding of integrated ecosystem planning and management is increased; (iv) knowledge management products are disseminated and used; and (v) local communities have increased awareness of biodiversity conservation and threats to biological resources. In addition, it will help identify promising and good practice ecosystem-based and adaptive mechanisms relevant to community-based conservation and sustainable natural resources use and help document and disseminate results of best practices to enable up-scaling to other landscapes in the country and across the region.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

The project is consistent with the priorities defined in the Philippine Development Plan (2011 to 2016). The Plan clearly specified that the integrated and community based ecosystem approach to ENR management shall be adopted to address environmental degradation. Natural resources management shall be directed at enhancing the state of different ecosystems

and the natural resources within them to provide resource dependent communities with livelihoods. Under the biodiversity conservation and protected area management targets, the Plan aims to strengthen management of existing PAs and additional PAs in priority KBAs. More specifically, the proposed updating of the Plan for 2016-2021 proposes the strengthening the network of protected areas within three priority biodiversity corridors. The project will contribute to the framework espoused in the upcoming National PA System Master Plan by demonstrating how the network approach to PA system management can be demonstrated at the corridor level. It will also contribute to the goals and targets of the PBSAP through the strengthening of existing PAs and expansion of the PA system, expanding and improving the knowledge on the extent, characteristics, uses and values of biodiversity, and by adopting the integrated ecosystems approach in the BD corridors to address fragmentation, thereby enhancing connectivity, and contribute to greater conservation outcomes. More importantly, the corridor level conservation framework is seen as the lower tier level translation of the PBSAP. The project will also contribute to the testing of its M&E system, and provide corridor level data and information for monitoring progress in PBSAP implementation and documenting impacts. The Aligned Philippine National Action Plan to combat desertification, land degradation and drought (PNAP-DLDD) 2015-2025 examines the natural factors and existing framework relevant to sustainable land management (SLM). Its geographical domain consists of 18 major river basins from where land degradation hotspots were identified. The strategic objectives of the PNAP include: 1) 15% reduction in poverty incidence of affected population by 2025 with the 2012 level as baseline; 2) 10 % increase in forest cover by 2025 with the 2010 level as baseline; and 3) 50,000 ha of land degradation hotspots adopting SLM practices per year as one of the strategies contributing to biodiversity conservation. The project will be able to directly contribute to the achievement of these outputs and results. Finally the project will contribute to the following seven Aichi Biodiversity Targets and its contribution will be tracked against indicators for which measureable targets will be adopted by stakeholders during the inception period.

Table 4: Project Contribution to Progress in Achieving Aichi Targets

Aichi Targets	Indicator	Project Contributions
Strategic Goal B Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced	Reduction in habitat loss, and fragmentation in two Biodiversity Corridors	2.4 million hectares of biodiversity corridors
Strategic Goal B Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity	Areas placed under sustainable agriculture and forest management	30,000 hectares
Strategic Goal C Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes	Expansion of protected areas to cover areas of high biological importance	200,000 hectares of other effective conservation measures (OECMs) established

Strategic Goal C Target 12:By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained	Populations of endangered species in the two Biodiversity Corridors remain stable or improved	<u>Central Mindoro</u> : Forest obligate species such as Tamaraw (<i>Bubalus mindorensis</i>); and Mindoro Bleeding heart pigeon (<i>Gallicolumba platanae</i>) <u>Eastern Mindanao</u> : Forest obligate species such as Mindanao Bleeding heart pigeon (<i>Gallicolumba crinigera</i>) and Philippine eagle (<i>Pithecophaga jefferyi</i>)
Strategic Goal D Target 14:By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable	-Improved management effectiveness of existing protected areas -Critical ecosystems restored/rehabilitated -Increased incomes of resource dependent communities from BD friendly enterprises	-20 point average increase in METT score for existing PAs covering 300,000 hectares -30,000 hectares -15%
Strategic Goal D Target 15:By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification (possible indicator - the extent of mitigative and adaptive measures for climate change and preventive measures for land degradation)	Increased carbon sequestration	17,503,045 metric tons of CO ₂ over 20 year period
Strategic Goal E Target 19:By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied	-Improved knowledge about the values, resources and habitat connectivity in 2 biodiversity corridors -Improved institutional and staff capacities for cross-sectoral planning, management, compliance monitoring and enforcement and decision making for integrated SLM and SFM	-To be informed through baseline and end of project knowledge, attitudes and practices study -20 point increase in capacities based on Capacity Assessment Scorecard

The Project will contribute to the attainment of SDG Target 15: Life on Land (Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss). In the Philippines, forests are home to about 20 million people, including about 7 – 8 million indigenous people. Sustainable management of forests will help ensure equal access to resources, and bring about improved living conditions for these communities. More importantly, the Project will directly address the threats to sustainable forest management and help in delivering ecosystem benefits to affected population. A large portion of corridors are also devoted to agriculture, and subjected to all forms of degradation and unsustainable land management practices. The Project will work with selected communities to influence their practices to reverse the current conditions. The net effect is the transformation of degraded lands into sustainably managed farms to support increased yields and higher farmer incomes. Finally, arresting the threats to biodiversity loss would be a direct outcome of the Project, through its work in tackling the institutional and policy constraints that impact on fragmentation and degradation of habitats; as well as practices that

encourage unsustainable use of biodiversity resources. Ultimately, the impact of the Project would be felt by communities and resource managers within and around the BD corridors, thus contributing to the attainment of SDG 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

Table 5: Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ^[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop(s)	UNDP Country Office	15,000	10,000	Within two months of project document signature
Inception Report	National Project Director	3,000	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Risk management	National Project Director Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	National Project Director and Monitoring Specialist	64,000	30,000	Annually before PIR
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	National Project Director and UNDP Country Office and UNDP- GEF team	None	None	Annually
NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Country Office	76,800 ^[2] ²	20,000	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	National Project Director and consultants	62,500	25,000	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	National Project Director and Monitoring Specialist UNDP Country Office	Covered above under Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	25,000	On-going
Stakeholder Engagement Plan	National Project Director and PMU UNDP Country Office		25,000	On-going

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ^[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Gender Action Plan	National Project Director UNDP Country Office UNDP GEF team	136,750	30,000	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	National Project Director UNDP Country Office	Covered above under Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	20,000	On-going
Addressing IP issues	National Project Director and consultants (IP policy/practice and IKSP)	45,500	30,000	On-going
Project Board meetings	Project Board UNDP Country Office National Project Director	None	30,000	At minimum annually
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office	None ^[3] ³	20,000	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None ¹²		Troubleshooting as needed
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Country Office and National Project Director and UNDP-GEF team		5,000	To be determined.
Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated	National Project Director and Monitoring Specialist	Covered above under Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	5,000	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	39,000	15,000	Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR.
Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated	National Project Director and Monitoring Specialist	Covered above under Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	5,000	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	39,000	20,000	At least three months before operational closure

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ^[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Translation of MTR and TE reports into English	UNDP Country Office	5,000		
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		486,550	315,000	

[1] Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

[2] Financing for NIM audits assigned to PMC (refer Budget Note 34 in Section X Total Budget and Work Plan of UNDP Project Document)

[3] The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator	5/21/2019	Gabriel Jaramillo, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+668090624	gabriel.jaramillo@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

<p>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): SDG Target 15: Life on Land (Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss</p> <p>Target 15.1: By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements</p> <p>Target 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally</p> <p>Target 15.5: Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species</p> <p>Target 15.9: By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts</p> <p>SDG Target 1: End Poverty in all its form everywhere:</p> <p>Target 1.1. By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance</p>					
<p>This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Program Document: National and local government and key stakeholders ensure that urbanization, economic growth, and climate change actions are converging for a resilient, sustainable and equitable development path of communities.</p>					
<p>This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:</p> <p>2.4.1 Gender-responsive legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions strengthened, and solutions adopted, to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources, in line with international conventions and national legislation</p>					
	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline[1]	Mid-term Target[2]	End of Project Target	Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions[3]

<p>Project Objective:</p> <p><i>Operationalizing integrated management of biological corridors to generate multiple benefits including effective conservation of globally significant biodiversity, reduced deforestation and degradation and enhanced community livelihoods</i></p>	<p>Indicator 1: GEF Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding Protected areas), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity; 	<p><i>Around 4-7% of forests within biodiversity hot-spots in selected clusters under threat of further fragmentation</i></p>	<p><i>Biological corridor integrated frameworks agreed among all stakeholders, including specific long-term conservation outcomes to be achieved management planning and management within the corridors</i></p>	<p><i>At least 200,000 hectares of biological corridors under improved management practices through establishment and improved management of Other Effective Area-based Conservation Efforts (OECMs) through ICCAs^[4], LCAs and privately-owned conservation estates,^[5]</i></p>	<p><u>Data Collection Methods:</u></p> <p><i>Project progress reports</i></p> <p><i>Field survey reports</i></p> <p><i>Community consultation and survey reports</i></p> <p><i>FAO EXACT reports</i></p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p><i>-Local communities, provincial and municipal governments understand livelihood benefits and ecological security from cooperation with and sustainable management of land, forest and seascape resources. Thus, they will participate in sustainable management and ecosystem restoration work.</i></p> <p><i>-The National and Provincial Governments consider it their priority to support integrated ecosystem management planning of its</i></p>
---	---	---	--	--	---

	<p><u>Indicator 2: GEF Core Indicator 6:</u> Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) as measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of agriculture, forestry and other land uses 	<p><i>Limited efforts within project biodiversity corridors to assess carbon values</i></p>	<p><i>Monitoring systems for estimation of carbon sequestered and/or avoided established</i></p>	<p>Total C benefits of 17,503,045 metric tons of CO₂ over 20-year period as follows:</p> <p>(a) C sequestered in agriculture, forestry and other land uses of 5,396,078 metric tons of CO₂ over 20-year period and (b) avoided emissions of 12,106,967 metric tons of CO₂ over 20-year period</p>	<p>biological corridors and implement target oriented activities with local communities to improve conservation and sustainable use of such resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provinces, Municipalities, CBOs, private sector and communities collaborate closely for preparation of IEM plans. <p><u>Risks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Natural disaster/climate change may affect the restoration work. -Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project. -Political transitions leave plans unused. -Livelihood benefits from sustainable
--	---	---	--	--	--

	<p><u>Indicator 3: GEF Core Indicator 11:</u> Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefits of GEF investment</p>	<p><i>Baseline of households participating in improved and alternative livelihoods and sustainable resource management will be established through the community cluster conservation planning process in Year 1</i></p>	<p><i>At least 9,000 individuals (belonging 2,250 households) are directly benefiting from sustainable natural resources management and improved and alternative livelihoods and incomes (at least 50% of beneficiaries are women of which 25% are IP women)</i></p>	<p><i>At least 65,000 individuals, with which 30% are indigenous peoples (belonging to 15,000 households) directly benefit through sustainable natural resource management and livelihood improvement approaches and increase of 15% in average economic benefit (at least 50% of beneficiaries are women, of which 25% are IP women)</i></p>	<p><i>management may be limited and slow for communities to give up current unsustainable practices</i> <i>- Lack of involvement from private sector and/or resource users (including vulnerable people) with continued unsustainable practices</i> <i>-Conflicts over territorial issues between provincial, municipal and national sector entities could undermine efforts at promoting integrated planning approaches.</i></p>
--	---	--	---	---	---

<p><i>Component 1: Effective coordination and governance framework for integrated ecosystem management in the Philippines biodiversity corridors system;</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator 4:</i> Number of policy instruments that are in place and applied to integrate biodiversity outcomes in sector and national and local planning policy and programs</p>	<p><i>Current policies are limited to detection of presence or absence of listed species rather than looking at impacts on broader ecological principles and processes for the survival of species, maintenance of ecological services, and habitat connectivity.</i></p>	<p><i>Policies reviewed, gap assessed and draft policy instruments under review</i></p>	<p><i>At least six instruments (updated safeguard standards and guidelines)[6]⁶ for improving biodiversity outcomes within the biodiversity corridors developed and adopted</i></p>	<p><u><i>Data Collection Methods:</i></u> <i>Project progress reports</i> <i>Policy instruments</i> <i>UNDP Capacity Scorecard</i> <u><i>Assumption:</i></u> <i>-The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and technical measures that facilitate integrated IEM planning and management in a timely manner.</i> <i>-Development strategies and IEM management strategies and plans will be officially agreed with Provincial governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for their implementation</i> <i>-The Provinces will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project</i> <i>-Local communities are convinced mainstreaming biodiversity into key</i></p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

	<p><u>Indicator 5:</u> Level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring integrated biodiversity management planning in biodiversity corridors as measured by UNDP's capacity development scorecard for the following institutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) 2. Department of Agriculture (DA) 3. National Commission for Indigenous People (NCIP) 	<p><i>Limited institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring of multiple use IBM planning and management in biological corridors as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values as indicated below: DENR- 47/74 DA: 28/42 NCIP: 16/39</i></p>	<p><i>Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 5-point increase in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values</i></p>	<p><i>Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by 15-20 points in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard from baseline values</i></p>	<p><i>development sectors is in their long-term interests</i> <u>Risks:</u> <i>-Priorities of provincial government, municipalities and local communities might shift if development benefits take long to manifest</i></p>
	<p><u>Indicator 6:</u> Extent to which the network of protected areas and other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs) within corridors have adopted automated biodiversity monitoring system for biodiversity and threat assessment</p>	<p><i>Monitoring system in protected areas paper-based and inefficient to capture real-time monitoring of biodiversity and threats. No monitoring system exists in OECMs</i></p>	<p><i>All eleven PAs within the two corridors have moved to automated biodiversity monitoring systems and design for OECMs completed</i></p>	<p><i>All protected areas (11) and OECMs (at least 9 ICCAs and 4 LCAs) within two biodiversity corridors have moved to automated system of monitoring of biodiversity and threats</i></p>	

<p><i>Component 2: Application of integrated network design and management of biodiversity corridors to ensure continued stability and sustainability of their biological, ecosystem services and socio-economic conservation values;</i></p>	<p><u>Indicator 7</u> (GEF Core Indicator 1.2): Management effectiveness of terrestrial protected areas within designated biological corridors supported by tenure security and improved resource access and sustainable use</p>	<p><i>Baseline METT scores[7]7:</i> <i>PA 1: Mts. Iglit Baco NP: 67</i> <i>PA 2: Mt. Calavite WS: 67</i> <i>PA 3: Agusan Marsh WS: 55</i> <i>PA 4: Alamio, Buayan, Caracan, Panikian River and Sipangpang Falls Watershed FR: 15</i> <i>PA 5: Aliwagwag Protected Landscape: 26</i> <i>PA 6: Andanan Watershed FR: 30</i> <i>PA 7: Cabadbaran Watershed: 20</i> <i>PA 8: Mainit Hotspring Protected Landscape: 42</i> <i>PA 9: Mati Protected Landscape: 20</i> <i>PA 10: Mt. Hamiguitan Range WS: 59</i> <i>PA 11: Surigao Watershed FR: 17</i></p>	<p><i>Average increase by at least 10 points in METT</i></p>	<p><i>Average increase by at least 20 points in METT from current PAs baselines covering 300,000 ha</i></p>	<p><u>Data Collection Methods:</u> <i>Project progress reports</i> <i>METT updates</i> <i>Biological survey and monitoring reports</i> - <u>Assumption:</u> <i>-Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by Provincial and Municipal governments with allocation of appropriate funding for their implementation</i> <i>-The Provinces and Municipalities will take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project</i> <i>-Local communities are convinced that critical habitats in their vicinities will benefit livelihoods and ecological security to them and they will participate in conservation and restoration work.</i> <i>-Local community-based institutions would establish an effective institutional mechanism to facilitate conservation outcomes</i></p> <p><u>Risk:</u> <i>-Administrative/political changes may undermine the implementation of the management plan strategies</i> <i>-Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project</i> <i>-Conflicts between provincial, municipal and sector entities and local communities regarding management and access to natural resources may undermine integrated planning approaches</i></p>
---	--	---	--	---	--

	<p><u>Indicator 8:</u> Status of status of key species remaining stable or increasing from the baseline:</p> <p><u>Central Mindoro:</u> Forest obligate species such as Tamaraw (<i>Bubalus mindorensis</i>); and Mindoro Bleeding heart pigeon (<i>Gallicolumba platanae</i>)</p> <p><u>Eastern Mindanao:</u> Forest obligate species such as Mindanao Bleeding heart pigeon (<i>Gallicolumba crinigera</i>) and Philippine eagle (<i>Pithecophaga jefferyi</i>)</p>	<p><i>Key species under continued threat from forest loss and degradation and poaching. Baselines[8]⁸ are:</i></p> <p><u>Mindoro:</u> Tamaraw \pm 500 (DENR 2018); Mindoro Bleeding Heart pigeon -50-249 mature adults (Birdlife 2018)</p> <p><u>Mindanao</u> Mindanao Bleeding Heart Pigeon -1,000-2,499 mature adults (Birdlife 2018); Philippine Eagle -180-500 mature adults (Birdlife 2018)</p>	<p><i>Baseline populations validated and monitoring protocols established</i></p>	<p><i>Key species populations stable or increasing from baseline values</i></p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> -Adequate technical capacity available for undertaking monitoring species populations -Certain species are declining because of hunting, and improved enforcement will increase population -Tamaraw populations depend on grassland availability and the removal of grazing pressure from domestic animals will lead to an increase in numbers</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> -External factors beyond the control of the project (e.g. climate change) might affect bird populations negatively</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---

	<p><u>Indicator 9:</u> Number of regional, provincial and local plans that mainstream objectives of integrated ecosystem management (IEM) within the biodiversity corridors: RDIPs, PPFPs, CLUPs/CDPs, ADSPPs</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Indicator 10:</u> Number of hectares impacted by the mainstreaming of SLM and SFM in relevant local planning instruments, measured by:</p> <p>(a) Area of degraded agricultural lands prioritized for avoiding degradation in relevant local planning instruments</p> <p>(b) Area of forest land prioritized for restoration in relevant local planning instruments</p>	<p><u>Indicator 9:</u> RDIPs, PPFPs and LGU CLUPs have limited attention to mainstreaming ecosystem consideration into their planning systems</p> <p><u>Indicator 10:</u> Limited attention and prioritization of SLM and SFM activities in RDIPs, PPFPs and LGU CLUPs</p>	<p><u>Indicator 9:</u> Guidelines, regulations and frameworks and capacity improvements being undertaken to facilitate biodiversity and ecosystem mainstreaming into sub-national planning systems</p> <p><u>Indicator 10:</u> Capacity building for LGU staff for mainstreaming completed, mainstreaming guidelines in place and CLUPs revision ongoing to incorporate and prioritize conservation investments,</p>	<p><u>Indicator 9:</u> Sub-national plans fully integrate IEM considerations within the two biological corridors as follows:</p> <p>RDIPs – 3 PPFPs – 9, and LGU CLUPs/CDPs – 24 ADSDPP – 9</p> <p><u>Indicator 10:</u> (a) At least 150,000 hectares of agricultural lands (b) At least 100,000 hectares of forest lands</p>	<p><u>Data Collection Methods:</u> Project progress reports LGU and regional development plans</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> -The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and technical measures that facilitate integrated local planning and management in a timely manner. -Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by provincial and local governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for implementation -The LGUs will take active part in developing strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project</p> <p><u>Risks:</u> -Priorities of local governments might shift if development benefits take long to manifest - Plans are developed but not used, particularly by resource users - Planning bodies that build capacity may not be adequately motivated for change</p>
--	---	--	--	---	---

<p><i>Component 3: Community-based sustainable use and management systems in the two pilot biodiversity corridor systems in the Philippines; and</i></p>	<p><u>Indicator 11: GEF Core Indicator 3: Area of lands restored, segregated by:</u> (a) Area of degraded agricultural lands restored (b) Area of forest land restored (c) Area of natural grass and shrub lands restored</p>	<p><i>Natural habitats under continued fragmentation due to agricultural expansion as result of declining productivity of existing agricultural lands and loss of livelihoods</i></p>	<p><i>At least: (a) 1,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands restored under SLM production systems; (b) 1,000 ha under of disturbed forest lands under improved SFM; and (c) 3,000 ha critical ecosystems under improved management</i></p>	<p><i>At least the following targets^[9] will be achieved: (a) 15,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands restored under SLM production systems; (b) 15,000 ha under of disturbed forest lands under improved SFM; and (c) 30,000 ha critical ecosystems under improved management</i></p>	<p><u>Data Collection Methods:</u> Project progress reports Field survey reports Community consultation reports Productivity assessment reports <u>Assumption:</u> -Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by Provincial and local governments with allocation of appropriate funding for their implementation -LGUs will take active part in developing strategies and implementation using knowledge and skills from project. -Local communities are convinced that critical habitats in their vicinities will benefit livelihoods and ecological security to them and will participate in conservation and restoration work.</p>
--	--	---	---	---	--

	<p><u>Indicator 12:</u> Number of Voluntary forest certification system piloted with local communities and privately managed forests for encouraging sustainable forest management</p>	<p><i>National criteria and indicators and governance for sustainable forest management not finalized</i></p>	<p><i>Forest certification system piloted in 3 sites including 2 community managed forest and one privately managed forest</i></p>	<p><i>Forest certification systems updated based on lessons from 2 sites including 1 community managed forest and one privately managed forest pilot and adopted by DENR and stakeholders</i></p>	<p><i>-Local community based institutions would establish an effective institutional mechanism to facilitate conservation outcomes</i></p> <p><i>- LGU capacity enhanced to provide adequate leadership and support to states</i></p> <p><u>Risk:</u></p> <p><i>-Administrative/political changes may undermine the implementation of the management plan strategies</i></p> <p><i>-Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project</i></p> <p><i>-Conflicts between national, provincial, LGUs and local communities regarding management and access to natural resources may undermine integrated planning approaches</i></p> <p><i>- Natural disasters/climate drivers exacerbate degradation</i></p>
--	--	---	--	---	--

<p><i>Component 4: Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming, learning and monitoring and evaluation</i></p>	<p><u>Indicator 13:</u> Level of awareness on IEM within the biodiversity corridors as indicated by KAP survey. [10]¹⁰</p>	<p><i>Coordinated outreach on conservation threats lacking. Limited awareness of impact of unplanned development among general public. Baseline survey established in Year 1</i></p>	<p><i>At least 40% sampled community members, government and sector agency staff, private sector and other stakeholders (at least 40% women) aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments and actions needed for corridor conservation</i></p>	<p><i>At least 60% (of which at least 40% women) of sampled community members, government and sector agency staff, private sector and other stakeholders aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments and behavior change for biodiversity outcomes</i></p>	<p><u>Data Collection Methods:</u> Project progress reports KAP survey reports Good practice documents Data use reports <u>Assumption:</u> - Stakeholders willing to actively participate in the review process. - -Project management will be able to identify, document and disseminate the best practices - Mid Term Review and End of Project Evaluation of the project will also contribute to identifying the best practices - Best practices from sustainable resource management readily available to resource users</p>
	<p><u>Indicator 14:</u> Integrated decision support system/ integrated information management system to monitor biodiversity threats and outcomes in place and effectively used.</p>	<p><i>All data collection in paper form with limited scope, quality, accessibility and use. Baseline to be established in Year 1</i></p>	<p><i>Automated information management system established and operational</i></p>	<p><i>100 % increase in number of inter-sectoral users from baseline</i></p>	<p><u>Risks:</u> - Government priorities may change from due to political pressure from resource users - Actions among the assorted agencies and NGOs remain uncoordinated - Community diversity will not be a hindrance to outreach activities</p>

	Indicator 15: Number of good practice conservation and sustainable resource management approaches applicable to different actors codified, disseminated nationally and adapted	Limited number of good practices in conservation and sustainable resource management codified, disseminated and applied	At least ten good practices in conservation and sustainable resource management codified and applied	At least thirty good practice in conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and adapted	
--	--	---	--	--	--

[1] Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

[2] Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

[3] Data collection methods should outline specific tools used to collect data and additional information as necessary to support monitoring. The PIR cannot be used as a source of verification.

[4] Agreements include the following: (i) registry for ICCAs; (ii) co-management agreements between LGU and DENR, and subsidiary co-management arrangements between LGUs and local communities; and (iii) MOUs between private estates and DENR for privately owned conservation areas

[5] The 200,000 ha of new set-asides will be established following the mapping and be achieved through new management planning and participatory management agreements and developed and implementation of basic management and resource use plans, rather than be classified as PAs, because Ips are reluctant to include their ancestral domains within a government managed PA system

[6] Specifically includes policies to incorporate biodiversity and gender considerations in biodiversity-friendly agriculture policy, extractive industries policy, biodiversity-friendly enterprise policy and local governance policy and improved guidelines (based on experiences from the ground) for integration of biodiversity safeguards within sector planning, regional development investment planning, provincial physical framework planning, municipal LGU comprehensive land use planning, indigenous conservation management planning

[7] These baseline METT scores will be validated in Year 1, in particular PAs 1, 2, 3 and 10 that have high baseline METT scores. All METT scores were developed through 2015-2017

[8] These numbers will be validated in Year 1 of the project

[9] Refer Indicators 9 and 10 on additional SLM and SFM projections through increased program investments in CLUPs

[10] The Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) approach will collect reference qualitative and quantitative declarative information on misunderstanding and barriers to behavior change, using appropriate tools including survey questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews, among others.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

The proposed changes from the PIF have been warranted by the guidance provided by STAP and other comments, namely that the project is too ambitious and proposed activities needed to be evaluated on their technical and institutional viability, and ensuring a more compelling and coherent approach to the project, as well as a substantial downscaling.

Comment	Response	Relevant Section of UNDP Project Document and - GEF CEO ER.
Comments from GEFSEC Review		
None		
Comments from STAP		
1. STAP is pleased to see maps of these areas included in the project proposal, though it must be said that the maps could be further improved if a subset of the entire country were included to indicate where in the country these two regions are located.	Maps for the two corridors (including insets) are provided in the UNDP Project Document along with additional maps in the Annexes	Refer Figures 2 and 3 and Annex 8 of UNDP Project Document
Comments from Germany		
1. The proposed project region is home to many indigenous people. Their important role in and contributions to the effective management of protected areas should be considered more prominently in the proposed project. This suggestion is based on extensive experiences of German development cooperation with their Philippines	This is fully recognized by the project. All of the clusters identified qualified for the HCV criteria 6 as almost all of the key areas where there is high biodiversity value, there are ancestral domains. One of the central strategies of this project is to support the indigenous peoples' claim to their ancestral domains in the two corridors. Within these ancestral domains, the project will assist in identifying biodiversity set asides or establishing and recognizing indigenous community conserved areas. The project strategy is based on experuneces with NewCAPP, ICCA and BPP and experiences from German Development Cooperation. Accordingly engagement with IPs is builkt on principles governed by FPIC. An IP Plan developed at PPG stage lays out procedures for involvement and engagement of IPs through many outputs of the project	Refer to UNDP project Document Outcomes 2 and 3 and Annex 15 (IP Plan)

<p>2. The PIF mentions locally managed conservation areas (OECMs) “<i>Expansion and diversification of PA system</i>”. Following the experience and lessons from a recently concluded UNDP-GEF NewCAPP project, the PA System master planning will include recognition of other area based conservation measures (OECMs) such as indigenous community conserved areas (ICCAs) and local conservation areas (LCAs) managed by local government units (LGUs). But does not mention Critical Habitats (CH). We therefore suggest consideration of CHs as one category of OECMs and the respective ongoing activities of BMB and development partners</p>	<p>Output 2.4 will finance detailed assessments of existing Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), high conservation value areas (HCVAs) or Critical Habitats (CHs) using range of biological and socio-ecological information such as the species distribution, habitat suitability maps and threats, on the basis of which at least 200,000 hectares of new conservation areas that will be incorporated in the conservation area network within the two biodiversity corridors. These new conservation areas will be in the form of OECMs will be largely co-managed by Indigenous People, local communities, and LGUs (or combination thereof) and incorporate KBAs, HCVs and CHs.</p>	<p>Refer Output 2.4 and Annex 8 of the UNDP Project Document</p>
<p>3. The PIF also does not mention ongoing activities of the German development cooperation implemented by GIZ together with Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB) on the establishment of CHs, the integration of their establishment in the Forest Land Use Planning (FLUP) and ultimately the integration of FLUPs in Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP). We therefore suggest consideration of Critical Habitats as one category of OECMs and the respective ongoing activities by BMB and development partners</p>	<p>The project builds on existing experiences in the Philippines, including the GIZ/BMB program. The recognition of HCVFs (including CHs) is the fundamental basis on which integration with the FLUP and ultimately the CLUP will be promoted</p>	<p>Refer UNDP Project Document Output 2.4 and Annex 10</p>

<p>4. Concerning monitoring (Output 1.4 A compliance monitoring and enforcement strategy developed and adopted). The PIF is not specific about, for example enforcement monitoring and monitoring for PA management, but prominently mentions scientific monitoring. However, for effective PA management (Output 2.1 PA specific management measures implemented in 11 protected areas in the two pilot corridors that increase management effectiveness), patrol-based spatial data collection is needed to provide up-to-date and timely information for management decision-making and planning. The Forest Management Bureau (FMB) introduced the system Lawin through the B-WISER project. BMB uses (e)BMS. We strongly suggest adding a section (including output) about the use of a Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) spatial patrol and biodiversity monitoring system based on the integration of Lawin and eBMS (enhanced Biodiversity Monitoring System). The final proposal should elaborate this in more detail explaining how the involved institutions can cooperate and establish a central database at DENR-KISS. Support to such DENR wide system would not only address the institutional concerns mentioned in the PIF but would also increase coherence with activities planned in proposal FAO GEF ID 9554</p>	<p>Output 1.3 entails a mixed model that incorporates elements at both national and sub-national levels to develop adequate structures of monitoring, surveillance, enforcement and prosecution at the national and sub-national levels. Given the varied structure and capacity at the sub-national level, the project intends that feasible interventions be initially trialed, assessed, and improved in the pilot corridors (under Component 2) before scaling up more widely in the country. In doing so the project will support (i) the improvement of data collection and analysis through development of mobile and software applications for data input and management; (ii) Training and skills development for effective mobile application and data management; (iii) Improving server facilities at national and protected area levels, including for patrolling teams (tablets); (iv) Development of guidelines on information needs for management of threats, apprehensions, evidence collection and prosecutions; and (v) Training in evidence collection, basic forensics, monitoring, surveillance and enforcement, in particular for protected species, resource extraction, and IAS control in the selected biological corridors.</p> <p>In addition under Output 3.3, the project will support community based forest management (through CBFMAs, IP groups, community groups, etc.) that will entail training and linkage with Lawin and eBMS.</p> <p>In Output 4.2, the project supports a harmonized information management system that develops simplified, standardized and dedicated information management that would be initially tested at the corridor level that would later be linked to DENR-KISS. We anticipate that FAO GEF ID 9554 will also be linked to the corridor specific database in the common Eastern Mindanao corridor site.</p>	<p>Refer UNDP Project Document Outputs 1.3, 3.3 and 4.2</p>
---	---	---

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 273,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews	136,500	81,486	55,014
Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Prodoc, CEO ER and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes	68,250	40,743	27,507
Component C: Validation Workshop and Report	68,250	40,743	27,507
Total	<u>273,000</u>	<u>162,972</u>	<u>110,028</u>

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

changes to the original project concept and rationale

The Table below summarizes changes made to the Outcomes and Outputs of the original PIF and the rationale for doing so. Most of the changes are intended to provide the project with a more coherent strategy, thereby reducing its complexity and the scattered nature of some activities based on the recommendation of STAP. The main changes relate to changing the component order and refining of the outcome/output descriptions.

	PIF (Original Project Concept)	GEF CEO ER (Changes)	RATIONALE
Components	Component 2: “Application of corridor wide IEM and integrated landscape management in two biodiversity corridors”	Component 2: “Application of network design and management of biological corridors to ensure continued stability and sustainability of their biological, ecosystem services and socio-economic conservation values”	The title of the component is refined to reflect the focus on the Outputs under this Component that looks at management of conservation networks and planning systems rather than more broadly on IEM approaches
	Component 4: None	New Component 4: “Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation”	Given the importance of improving knowledge and raising awareness amongst all segments of society, from policy makers to local communities and embracing public and private sectors, so as to actively engage them in conservation efforts, as well as to mainstream gender, a separate Component 4 with three Outputs has been added
Project Outcomes	Outcome 2.1: “Improved Protected Area management effectiveness delivers effective protection to 300,000 ha of existing PAs within the selected pilot biodiversity corridors” Outcome 2.2: “Appropriate SLM and SFM technologies implemented by local communities”	Outcome 2: “Improved site-level planning, regulatory, monitoring and implementation framework for demonstration of integrated ecosystem planning and management of pilot biodiversity corridors”	Given that Component 3 is dealing with “Community-based sustainable use and management systems” there is consensus that since Outcome 2.2 (SLM and SFM) of the PIF entails technologies to be implemented by local communities, that Outcome 2.2 should be more appropriate under Component 3.
	Outcome 4: none	Outcome 4: “Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation support increased awareness of biodiversity conservation, improved and collaborative decision-making and equitable gender benefits”	Having a separate knowledge management Outcome reflects the priority assigned by GEF and UNDP to creation of awareness and improved availability and access to knowledge.

Output 1.1 “IEM framework and plans for two corridors developed and approved	Moved to Component 2 and sub-divided two outputs, namely Output 2.1 “ Integrated ecosystem management framework developed and adopted for two biodiversity corridors” and Output 2.5 “Capacitating local and regional governments and sector stakeholders to mainstream biodiversity conservation measures tested in the pilot corridors into their policies, planning and monitoring systems”	As Component 1 is intended to focus on national level policy, institutional and regulatory foundational activities necessitated for integrated corridor management, that are to be tested under Components 2, the logical positioning of PIF Output 1.1 that deals with corridor level frameworks and planning would be within Component 2. Targets have been kept as follows: : At least 3 of RDIPs, 9 of PFPs and at least 24 LGU CLUPS (the latter reduced from 107 plans) revised to fully integrate biodiversity considerations from IBM framework and plans within the two biological corridors.
Output 1.2: “Policies and programs of key sectors such as agriculture and forestry.....made consistent with IEM goals and objectives”	Output 1.2: “Policy instruments (biodiversity and community safeguard standards and guidelines) for improving biodiversity outcomes within the biodiversity corridors developed and adopted”	As approval of policies are a function of governmental processes that is beyond the control of the project, it would be more prudent to focus on development of policy instruments (standards and guidelines) rather on policy itself
Output 1.3 “Dedicated cross-sectoral landscape biological corridor coordination platform established.....for biodiversity management nationwide”	Moved to Output 1.1 “Functional governance and coordination mechanism established at national level to facilitate integrated ecosystem planning and management of Biodiversity Corridors”	Moved to Output 1.1 for better sequencing of Outputs
Output 1.4: “A compliance monitoring and enforcement strategy developed and adopted.....”	Moved to Output 1.3	Moved for better sequencing of Outputs
Output 1.5: “Training programs established and institutionalized.....”	No separate Output on training	Rather than separate out all “training” as an individual Output, training is incorporated into each Output to provide focus and relevance.
Output 1.6: “Replication strategy developed and approved backed by a financial sustainability strategy” AND Output 1.7 “Sustainable mechanisms established for lessons sharing and dissemination....”	Combined and moved to Output 4.3 “Knowledge Management and project experiences contributes to learning and facilitates replication and scaling up of integrated biodiversity management approaches elsewhere in the country”.	As a separate Component 4 was introduced that deals with KM, gender and M&E that also entails capturing of lessons learned, the financial sustainable and replication strategy should be more appropriate in the KM Component as it would be developed based on learning and experience from the project
Output 2.1 “IPA specific management measures implemented in 11 protected areas....”	Moved to Output 2.3: Improved management effectiveness of existing protected areas within the two biological corridors (still covers PIF target of 300,000 ha)	Moved to Output 2.3 for better sequencing of prior steps in Output 2.1 “Integrated biodiversity management framework developed for two biodiversity corridors” and Output 2.2 “Site-specific integrated cluster conservation planning”

	Output 2.2: “At least 200,000 ha of new conservation area identified and afforded protection...”	Moved to Output 2.4 “Recognition of a network of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECM) to accord improved protection and conservation to additional areas within key biodiversity areas”	Moved for sequencing purposes and still covers PIF target of 200,000 ha. However, based on IP consultation during PPG there is no support for creation of new PAs in the ancestral domains, rather the emphasis now is to improve the management of these areas for biodiversity conservation and community sustainable resource use
	Output 2.3. “30,000 ha of critical ecosystems rehabilitated....”	Subsumed under Output 2.3	As critical ecosystem rehabilitation is proposed within critical habitats in the PAs, this Output will be implemented as part of Output 2.3, but will not focus on marine and coastal habitats as proposed in the PIF as the two corridors encompass terrestrial habitats exclusively

<p>Output 2.4. “Management plans for 200,000 ha open access forests”</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Output 2.5 “SLM measures applied in 300,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands...”</p>	<p>Moved in Component 3 as Output 3.3 “Fragmentation of biodiversity habitats reduced through SFM and collaborative management”</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Output 3.2: “Sustainable land management applied to degraded agricultural lands through application of a suite of SLM technologies/practices and incentives”</p>	<p>These Outputs moved from Outcome 2 to Outcome 3 for reasons outlined in Outcome 2 changes above. Implementation of SLM and SFM takes into consideration the existing capacity, budget and time constraints under which the project operates. Accordingly, in terms of SLM, the project focuses on the following approach: (i) Design and implementation of SLM exemplars in 150 ha of farmers lands to demonstrate application of a variety of SLM best practices; (ii) Incentive mechanisms for wider application of SLM and biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices in 15,000 ha with project support; and (iii) Through the best practices introduced under Output3.2 and policies introduced under Component 1, it is expected that mainstreaming of SLM principles and strategies in the 24 Municipal Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) will take place as described in Output 2.5. It is anticipated that as a consequence, that program investment and budget prioritization for 150,000 ha of agricultural lands avoiding degradation will be included by the respective LGUs in their collective CLUPs. Similarly, in terms of SFM, the project will target 15,000 ha of degraded forest land for assisted natural regeneration. In addition it is anticipated that through the best practices introduced under 3.3 and policies introduced under Component 1 mainstreaming of SLM principles and strategies in the 24 Municipal Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) will take place as described in Output 2.5. It is anticipated that as a consequence, that program investment and budget prioritization for 100,000 ha of forest lands avoiding degradation will be included by the respective LGUs in their collective CLUPs.</p>
<p>Output 3.2: “Farmer cooperatives engaged in sustainable land management practices....”</p>	<p>Subsumed under Output 3.2 “Sustainable land management applied to degraded agricultural lands through application of a range of SLM technologies/practices and incentives”</p>	<p>Farmer cooperatives is one institutional arrangements along with IP groups, community organizations etc. that will be involved with implementation of SLM activities within agricultural lands under GEFCEO ER Output 3.2 and therefore is not considered as a separate Output</p>

	Output 3.3 “At least 5 communities and private sector groups engaged in biodiversity friendly livelihood and business enterprise....”	Moved to Output 3.4: “Biodiversity-friendly livelihood and business enterprises provide financial and other incentives to avoid biodiversity loss and lead to natural resources use sustainability”	Output title revised to reflect linkage between agricultural productivity and biodiversity and ecosystem services functions
	Output 3.4: “Resource use plans and management practices of existing community based organizations incorporate biodiversity issues and improve connectivity”	Subsumed under Output 3.3 “Fragmentation of biodiversity habitats reduced through SFM and collaborative management”	Community based organizations such as CBFMAs, IP organizations, etc.) will be key partners in applying SFM practices under GEFCEO ER Output 3.3 and are not considered to be included as a separate output
	3.5: Financial and other incentives developed and applied to encourage investments and enterprises to avoid biodiversity loss....”	No separate Output considered in GEFCEO ER	Application of financial and other incentive mechanisms are intrinsically linked to Outputs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 so as to provide leverage and uptake of SFM, SLM and biodiversity-friendly livelihoods and therefore not considered as a separate output.
Co-financing	USD 67,500,320	USD 64,708,903	A slight variation that ensures a more realistic assessment of co-financing during the PPG stage

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

Annex E: GLF / Core Indicator Worksheet

Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
300,000	300,000		

1.1 Terrestrial protected areas newly created

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
NA			

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
NA						

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO Endorsement	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
NA			

1.2 Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
300,000	300,000		



Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Mts. Iglit-Baco Natural Park	1337	II	106,000	106,000		
Mount Calayute Wildlife Sanctuary	14729	IV	14,707	14,707		
Agusan Marsh Wildlife Sanctuary	145492	IV	40,752	40,752		
Alamio, Buayan, Carac-an, Panikian Rivers and Sipangpang Falls Watershed Forest Reserve	555583095	V	5,784	5,784		
Aliwagwag Protected	555583080	V	11,570	11,570		

+ Cabadbaran Watershed Forest Reserve	306541	VI	15,776	15,776		
Mainit Hot Spring Protected Landscape	7232	V	8,098	8,098		
Mati Protected Landscape	306531	V	1,067	1,067		
Mount Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary	555583083	IV	15,830	15,830		
Surigao Watershed Forest Reserve	306539	V	967	967		
Expansion of existing PAs above			65,000	65,000		
TOTAL			300,000	300,000		

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO Endorsement	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Mts. Iglit-Baco Natural Park	67	77	87
Mount Calavite Wildlife Sanctuary	67	76	87
Agusan Marsh Wildlife Sanctuary	55	67	75
Alamio, Buyaan, Carac-an, Panikian Rivers and Sipangpang Falls Watershed Forest Reserve	15	39	56
Aliwagwag Protected Landscape	26	56	72
Andanan River Watershed Forest Reserve	30	58	65
Cabadbaran Watershed Forest Reserve	20	46	65
Mainit Hot Spring Protected Landscape	42	61	71
Mati Protected Landscape	20	46	66
Mount Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary	59	69	79
Surigao Watershed Forest Reserve	17	56	66

Core Indicator 3: Area of land restored (hectares)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
530,000	30,000		

3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
300,000	15,000		

3.2 Area of forest and forest land restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
200,000	15,000		

Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
200,000	200,000		

4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, noncertified)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Qualitative description at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Qualitative description at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Qualitative description at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Qualitative description at TE
200,000	A network of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECM) ¹	200,000	A network of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECM)				

4.2 Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Ha (expected at PIF)	Type of Certification at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Type of Certification at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Type of Certification at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Type of Certification at TE
NA							

4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (expected at PIF)	Description of Management Practices at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Description of Management Practices at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Description of Management Practices at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Description of Management Practices at TE
NA							

4.4 Area of High Conservation Value forest loss avoided

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
NA			

Name of HCVF	Ha (expected at PIF)	Counterfactual at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Counterfactual at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
NA						

Core Indicator 6: Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use

GHG emission type	Ha (expected at PIF)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (baseline at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (baseline at CEO ER)	Ha (expected at MTR)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (above baseline at MTR)	Ha (expected at TE)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (above baseline at TE)
Lifetime direct project GHG emissions mitigated	1,130,000	44.3 Million Metric tons over 20 years	530,000	7,271 Million Metric tons over 20 years	Not determined	3 million Metric tons	Not determined	7,271 Million Metric tons over 20 years
Lifetime direct post-project emissions mitigated	1,130,000	Not determined	530,000	10,232 Million Metric tons over next 14 years	Not determined	Not determined	Not determined	10,232 Million Metric tons over next 14 years
Total GHG emissions mitigated	1,130,000	Not determined	530,000	17,503 Million Metric tons over 20 years	Not determined	Not determined	Not determined	17,503 Million Metric tons over 20 years

² Assumes that 40% and 45% of the total carbon emission mitigated are achieved in the first 6 years for avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration respectively

³ Assumes that 60% and 55% of the total carbon emissions are achieved for the next 14 years post-project for avoided deforestation and carbon sequestration respectively

Core Indicator 11. Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Total number (expected at PIF)	Total number (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total number (achieved at MTR)	Total number (achieved at TE)
Women	NA	32,500		
Men	NA	32,500		
Total	NA	65,000		

ANNEX: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Influencing models			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deploy innovative financial instruments		
<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Capital providers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large corporations	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SMEs	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Grant Pilot	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Project Reflow	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Communities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Engagement		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness Raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Campaigns	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Behavior Change	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity, Knowledge and Research			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Generation and Exchange		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Theory of Change	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indicators to Measure Change	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Innovation		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge and Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Innovation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Engagement Plan		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Equality			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Mainstreaming		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries	

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women groups	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitive indicators	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender results areas		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access and control over natural resources	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation and leadership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to benefits and services	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge generation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal Areas/Theme			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Programs		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Commodity Supply Chains (1 st Good Growth Partnership)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodities Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Screening Tools
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Conservation Value Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Carbon Stocks Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Soybean Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Oil Palm Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Beef Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Resilience (climate and shocks)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Production Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agroecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land and Soil Health
			<input type="checkbox"/> Diversified Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Land and Water Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small and Medium Enterprises
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Genetic Diversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Gender Dimensions
			<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder Platforms
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Restoration
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodity Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Land Use Planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Landscapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Cities	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated urban planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban sustainability framework
			<input type="checkbox"/> Transport and Mobility
			<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal waste management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Green space
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Biodiversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal Financing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Resilience

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected Areas and Landscapes	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Protected Areas
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal and Marine Protected Areas
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Landscapes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Seascapes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Natural Resource Management
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tourism
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & agrobiodiversity
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fisheries
			<input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure
			<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (National Standards)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (International Standards)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Species	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Illegal Wildlife Trade
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened Species
			<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife for Sustainable Development
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Wild Relatives
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plant Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Animal Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Livestock Wild Relatives
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangroves
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea Grasses
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rivers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lakes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tropical Rain Forests
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tropical Dry Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate Forests
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grasslands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paramo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Desert
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial and Accounting	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Payment for Ecosystem Services
			<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Trust Funds
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Finance
		<input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Protocol to the CBD	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety
			<input type="checkbox"/> Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
	<input type="checkbox"/> Forests		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest and Landscape Restoration	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> REDD/REDD+
			<input type="checkbox"/> Amazon
			<input type="checkbox"/> Congo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drylands
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Land Management	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem Approach
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community-Based NRM

			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Agriculture
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Pasture Management
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Fire Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation Neutrality	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Productivity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Cover and Land cover change
			<input type="checkbox"/> Carbon stocks above or below ground
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security	
	<input type="checkbox"/> International Waters		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ship	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Aquifer
			<input type="checkbox"/> River Basin
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Basin
		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances	
		<input type="checkbox"/> SIDS : Small Island Dev States	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from Wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/> Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Action Plan Implementation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large Marine Ecosystems	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Aquaculture	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Marine Protected Area	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangrove
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Seagrasses
			<input type="checkbox"/> Polar Ecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Constructed Wetlands
	<input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals and Waste		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mercury	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Power Plants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cement	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ozone	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sound Management of chemicals and Waste	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Waste Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste
			<input type="checkbox"/> e-Waste
		<input type="checkbox"/> Emissions	

		<input type="checkbox"/> Polychlorinated Biphenyls	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eco-Efficiency	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticides	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Vector Management	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Other	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Emissions	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Open Burning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Green Chemistry	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance
			<input type="checkbox"/> Least Developed Countries
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small Island Developing States
			<input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Risk Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea-level rise
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Resilience
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate information
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem-based Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Programme of Action
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Plan
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector
			<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Complementarity
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community-based Adaptation
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Livelihoods
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land Use
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Endogenous technology
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Needs Assessment
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
		<input type="checkbox"/> United Nations Framework on Climate Change	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nationally Determined Contribution
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paris Agreement
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Development Goals
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance (Rio Markers)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 1
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 2
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 1
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 2



Submitted to GEF Secretariat Review

[Go To Home](#)