

Sustainable Management of Natural Resources towards Rehabilitation and Preservation of the Key Biodiversity Area along Bataan Province to Manila Bay

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10704

Countries

Philippines

Project Name

Sustainable Management of Natural Resources towards Rehabilitation and
Preservation of the Key Biodiversity Area along Bataan Province to Manila
Bay

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

11/26/2021

Review completed by PM

1/18/2022

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/28/2022- All cleared.

JS 1/26/2022

1. Noted, thank you.

2. Readability of the budget has been barely improved in Annex E while columns are no longer aligned throughout the table in this new submission. Please increase the font size in Annex E by presenting the budget per outcome only (instead of details per output) so that there are less columns to fit within margins. Likewise the column other LOAs, which is empty, could be removed.

JS 1/24/2022

1. In section 6 ? Institutional Arrangements and Coordination, the last sentence of paragraph 252 (which is duplicated in paragraph 253) states: *?It should be noted that the identified Operational Partner (OP), results to be implemented by the OP and budgets to be transferred to the OP are non-binding and may change due to FAO internal partnership and agreement procedures which have not yet been concluded at the time of submission.?*

This statement seems to indicate that as the final arrangements have not been finalized yet, the transferring of budgets to the Operational Partners (which in GEF language are the Executing Partners) is not guaranteed. If so, this conditionality cannot be accepted as if materialized, it implies that the Implementing Agency could ending up carrying out executing functions (funds management).

Please :

1a - amend this statement in the Portal and in the ProDoc.

1b - remove the duplicate in paragraph 253.

2. The budget in Annex E the portal is not readable. Please include in the portal a budget that can be properly reviewed. Please notably note that the budget can be presented per Outcome rather than per Output, to make the table slimmer and fit within the margins.

JS 12/15/2021- Same as PIF, cleared.

We note that the duration of the project was changed from 36 months to 48 months, which is indeed more adequate.

Agency Response

2. The budget has been revised with a bigger font and repasted.

1a. The comment is well noted.

This is a standard statement used in FAO-GEF project documents, as per FAO's Operational Partner Implementation Modality (due diligence to be conducted before signing an agreement) and the statement indeed does not imply that FAO will execute any portion of the budget.

It does mean that in extremis the transfer to the Operational Partner/Executing Partner mentioned in the document may not materialize, but that does not mean that it cannot

approach another OP/EA and would automatically come to FAO, as IA also becoming EA.

Any change required will be done in a consultative manner

1b. The repetition in para 252 has been removed.

2. The budget has been pasted again and is more readable.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/15/2021-

1. We note PIF stage output 2.1.5 "Two gender-responsive integrated landscape management plans for Alcamen and Talisay watersheds adopted and implemented through an inclusive and participatory process by multi-stakeholders, including NGOs, CBOs, community resource user groups, private sector" has disappeared in this submission. The explanation provided is that "It was considered during PPG that establishing new management mechanisms/plans for these watersheds might move attention away from existing framework plans including the MBSDMP and PDPFP". However, the CEO endorsement request still plans to organize consultations to discuss potential establishment of a governance mechanism for Alcamen and Talisa watersheds and provide technical assistance to it if deemed appropriate (activity 4 under output 1.1.2).

Please clarify why:

(i) consultations on the relevance of a watershed governance mechanism for Almacen and Talisay watersheds have not been carried out or were not conclusive during PPG;

(ii) new watershed governance mechanism for these watersheds are still envisaged as part of the project when establishing them was deemed counterproductive to the project design?

The rest is aligned with that approved at PIF stage.

Agency Response

11 Jan 2022

1. (i) As explained in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan/CEO ER, it was discovered during the PPG stage that a governance structure or mechanism for these two watersheds are not in place yet. A wide range of stakeholders were consulted on the relevance of such watershed governance mechanism for Almacén and Talisay watersheds. Most stakeholders pointed the project design team towards other priorities, but some stakeholders expressed the view that such governance mechanism should still be considered. The project design team concluded that more detailed assessments and consultations were needed before any final conclusion can be made. In particular, further consultations should take place with local government units (LGUs) as well as local communities.

(ii) As explained above, this will depend on the further assessments and consultations. A governance mechanism could still be envisaged (building on existing platforms that ensure sustainability beyond project implementation), but it wouldn't play the central role that had been envisioned during PIF stage (because of the central role played by the MBSDMP and PDPFP).

The following adjustments have been made in the CEO ER to make this clearer:

? In Annex I2, the following adjustment has been made:

*?Nevertheless, under Output 1.1.2, the project will **further** discuss the potential establishment of a watershed governance mechanism for Almacén and Talisay watersheds with relevant stakeholders, based on the outcomes of **more detailed assessments and consultations.***

? In Annex H (work plan) of the ProDoc, the following adjustment has been made: *Output 1.12, Activity 4. ?Based on the above assessments and under the guidance of the multi-stakeholder platform and the River Basin Control Office (RBCO), **hold more detailed consultations to discuss potential** establishment of a watershed governance mechanism for Almacén and Talisay watersheds. Organize consultations and provide technical assistance to establish such governance mechanism, if **considered relevant by stakeholders.***

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 12/15/2021- Cleared.

We note with satisfaction that co-financing increased from \$15.5 million at PIF stage to \$17 million in this submission.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 12/15/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 12/15/2021- Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 1/18/2022- Cleared.

JS - 1/11/2022

2- Thank you for the update. Please add the METT baseline score for RPL in the portal entry:

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)
Bataan National Park	7215	National Park	19,211.00	20,004.00			67.00
Roosevelt Protected Landscape	7214	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		786.40			0.00

The rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 12/15/2021- We note the explanation provided in section II.1a.8 to justify changes made to the core indicators. However:

1. The total targets decreased by close to 40% (from 242,429 ha to 149,425 ha) compared to that approved at PIF stage when the financing request remains the same. Please thoroughly justify the low cost efficiency of the project (in particular, provide and justify cost assumptions for the restoration activities) and/or revise the targets.
2. We note the portal entry states "*For Core Indicator 1, the METT assessment for Roosevelt Protected Landscape (RPL) is currently ongoing and will be available only after the project starts. This PA was, thus, included under Core Indicator 4 target*". Core indicator 4 is only for land areas outside of protected areas. Please thus provide the surface area, baseline METT score and associated BD tracking tool for the Roosevelt Protected Landscape under core indicator 1 and remove the corresponding area that was reported under core indicator 4:

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)
Bataan National Park	7215	National Park	19,211.00	20,004.00			67.00		
Roosevelt Protected Landscape	7214	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		0.00			0.00		

Please consult with GEFSEC if there are justified reasons to expect long delays in obtaining the baseline METT score. In any case, all protected areas must be reported under core indicator 1.

3. Core indicator 5 is only for area of marine habitat outside of protected areas. Please confirm that there is no MPA in the 59,341 ha reported under this indicator.

4. Please clarify what is meant by "of which 3,473 ha of on-the-ground interventions" in core indicator 4's explanation "69,963 ha (total land area of 7 target LGUs, minus the other Core Indicator targets to avoid double-counting), of which 3,473 ha of on-the-ground interventions". Our understanding is that the project would support enhanced implementation of land use plans over the full area reported under core indicator 4.

5. Please provide a target under core indicator 6 to capture the climate mitigation co-benefits of the project.

6. Please provide a short explanation on how the targets, including the number of beneficiaries (Core indicator 11), were derived under table F. In this explanation, please include a cross-reference to the table presenting changes made to core indicators compared to PIF stage, which is included in section II.1a.8 of this submission.

Agency Response

17 Jan 2022

2 - The METT baseline score for RPL has now been added in the portal.

1. The main focus of the project is biodiversity conservation (both terrestrial and coastal/marine) and sustainable land management. The high restoration target from PIF (176,408 ha) under Core Indicator 3 had, in fact, been indicated by mistake. This area referred to the sea area of Bataan (municipal waters spanning 15 km from the coastline),

so it should have been indicated under Core Indicator 5, not 3. Additionally, the indicated sea area at PIF was considered inaccurately calculated ? the calculation was refined and made clearer during PPG.

The project design team is of the view that that the total target of 149,425 ha for a total GEF grant of USD 2.7 million is ambitious and that the project is not of low cost efficiency. The project will work on capacity enhancement that will go beyond the project's direct target area and duration (such as for the implementation of BDFEs, harmonization of plans, implementation of the MBSDMP, engagement of indigenous peoples, etc.).

In terms of restoration, it has to be noted that the project first and foremost aims to avoid further degradation (through improved capacity, management, livelihoods, knowledge and awareness), which is considered most relevant in the project context. This is why Core Indicator 3 target is relatively small (117 ha).

In terms of cost assumptions for the restoration activities, the following justification is provided:

- 100 ha (farmland under soil and water conservation resulting from Output 2.1.5): USD 40,000 for Technical assistance for soil and water conservation/SALT, and USD 50,000 to POs/farmers organizations/farmers for implementation of the above activities. This gives an average cost of 900/ha, with capacity development and the potential for replication and scaling built into the process.

- 17 ha (mangroves under community-based restoration/ management resulting from Output 2.1.2): Estimated approx. USD 10,000 to support local communities, which would give an average cost of 588/ha for community-based ecological restoration and conservation. This will be confirmed during the more detailed consultations with coastal communities.

Some additional restoration activities may be conducted under the CBFMAs and PACBRMAs (Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3), but these are very much linked with improved conservation and management so are counted under Core Indicator 4.

2. The METT file for RPL is now available and has been uploaded in the documents section of the Portal and in the ProDoc as Additional Annex. Core Indicator 1 and 4 targets have been revised accordingly; RPL is now reported under Core Indicator 1.

3. We confirm that there is currently no MPA included in the 59,341 ha. As explained in Section 1.A of the CEO ER, six (6) fish sanctuaries or locally protected marine protected areas (MPAs) were established in the early 2000s along Bataan's coast, through municipal ordinances. Two of them are located in the above marine area under Core Indicator 5, namely Abucay Fish Sanctuary (1.5 ha) and Bagac Local Marine Protected Area (13.7 ha). However, these sanctuaries appear to be currently inactive, they do not have any management structure, and detailed data on their habitat and

extension is missing. Thus, the project team does not consider them to meet the MPA criteria under the GEF Core Indicator definition. In line with the MBSDMP, the future establishment and operationalization of locally protected MPAs may be supported by the project (such as, through community consultations, data gathering), but this will depend on the outcomes of the consultations held during the harmonization of the land and sea use plans under Output 1.1.3.

4. Yes, the understanding is correct. By "on-the-ground interventions" we were referring to the local implementation in PACBRMAs, CBFMAs, NGPs, and ADSDPPs within the target area, while the larger target refers to the entire area under improved implementation of CLUPs. We have added "**with local communities**" to make it clearer.

5. A target has been added under Core Indicator 6 to capture the climate mitigation co-benefits of the project. The corresponding EX-ACT calculation (direct and indirect) and explanation file (Annex N of ProDoc) have been uploaded to the Portal.

6. The following explanation has been added under the Core Indicator table:

The calculation of the Core Indicator targets is explained in detail in the Project's Result Framework (Annex A1 of ProDoc/Annex A in CEO ER) as well as Figure 15 of the CEO ER, as summarized below:

- *Core Indicator 1 (terrestrial PAs): Includes the entire area of BNP (20,004 ha) and RPL (786.4 ha).*
- *Core Indicator 3 (restoration): Includes 100 ha of farmland under soil and water conservation (Output 2.1.5) and 17 ha of mangroves under community-based restoration/management (Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3).*
- *Core Indicator 4 (improved management to benefit biodiversity): 69,176.6ha. Based on total land area of 7 target LGUs = 90,084 ha minus 20,004 ha+786.4 ha and 117 ha to avoid double-counting with Core Indicators 1 and 3. This area will be under improved management plans including CLUPs, FLUPs, and local community plans and their implementation.*
- *Core Indicator 5 (marine habitat excl. MPAs): 59,341 ha. Based on total area of municipal waters of 7 target LGUs = 59,341 ha (see Figure 15 in CEO ER). Will benefit from reduced sedimentation from the upstream interventions, as well as from the management plans and other coastal/marine interventions.*
- *Core Indicator 6 (GHG mitigated): See EX-ACT calculation and explanation file in Annex N.*
- *Core Indicator 11 (beneficiaries): 10,000 (5,000 female, 5,000 male), of which 975 are indigenous peoples. A separate beneficiary file was prepared during PPG for the detailed beneficiary calculation. It is composed of:*
 - (1) Component 1 number of staff trained: 250 (50% women)*

(2) Component 2 local beneficiaries: 1,810 (50% women, at least 280 indigenous peoples) (overlap with (3) below, thus not included in overall total to avoid double-counting)

(3) Component 3 local stakeholders reached by project's outreach activities, KM & communications: 9,750 (50% women)

The changes in Core Indicator targets compared to those included at PIF stage are explained in Section II.1a.8 of the CEO ER."

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/15/2021- Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022- Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021- We note the extensive complementary baseline table provided in section II.6.

1. Given the projects` focus on BDFE in protected area landscapes and seascapes, and even though there is no geographic overlap, the project should acknowledge the following GEF-7 projects in the baseline and could usefully engage in knowledge sharing with them during implementation :

- 10386 Natural Capital Accounting and Assessment: Informing development planning, sustainable tourism development and other incentives for improved conservation and sustainable landscapes - UNEP

-10536 Protecting priority coastal and marine ecosystems to conserve globally significant Endangered, Threatened, and Protected marine wildlife in southern Mindanao, Philippines - UNDP

Agency Response 1. Thank you for the suggestion. The two projects have been added in the table in Section 6.b of the CEO ER (*Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives*).

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 1/11/2022 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 12/15/2021-

1. output 1.1.1: Please clarify what would be the mandate of the multi-sectoral/multi-stakeholder platform (consultative only? decision making power? On which matters?) and how the "clear mandate" on ecosystems management would be conferred to the platform. If the "mandate" is to go beyond a consultative body please clarify how the mandate would articulate with that of the existing mandated agencies and whether some agencies indicated they were ready to delegate some of their mandate to such a platform.

2. Trainings under outputs 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4: The descriptions of all these outputs include project-supported trainings. However, some intended trainings seem to greatly overlap (e.g. "POs will be trained in developing a Business Development Strategy facilitated by BMB's field officers" under 2.1.3 and "Training support will be provided on geographical indication (GI), value chain and market linkages, financial literacy, post-harvest technologies, and marketing in collaboration with existing organizations" under 2.1.4), many of these descriptions do not specify who will be the trainer (existing local institution, consultant to be hired?) and the trainees, and none clarify how these trainings will be institutionalized and replicated/upscaled.

Please (i) confirm that there is no duplication or revise. Please also systematically clarify (ii) trainees and trainers and (iii) how the trainings will be institutionalized and replicated/upscaled, (iv) how synergies will be found in training roll out when the same people are targeted for multiple trainings. It is suggested to develop a matrix showing, for targeted stakeholder group, the trainings the project plans to carry out, by whom, and how they will be institutionalized/replicated/upscaled.

3. Same question as 2 for the project-supported monitoring under 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.5.

4. outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4:

4.1-Please clarify why the project plans to support BDFE beyond those that are officially recognized by DENR.

4.2- Please provide explicit criteria for the BDFE, BDFAPs and livelihood opportunities that will be supported, explaining how it will be ensured in practice that these have the intended biodiversity and livelihood impacts. Literature shows that there is no automatic link between livelihood interventions and biodiversity benefits (see e.g. link between Roe, Dilys, et al. "*Are alternative livelihood projects effective at reducing local threats to specified elements of biodiversity and/or improving or maintaining the conservation status of those elements?*" Environmental Evidence 4.1 (2015): 22; or the USAID analysis https://rportal.net/biodiversityconservation-gateway/projects/closed-global-projects/measuring-impact/mi-project-resources/integrating-livelihood-and-conservation-goals-a-retrospective-analysis-of-world-bank-projects/at_download/file?subsite=biodiversityconservation-gateway).

4.3 A total of \$520,000 is budgeted for financial assistance under these outputs. Please clarify what form will take the financial assistance to beneficiaries (small grants? Micro-finance?), through which mechanism(s) and partner(s) it will delivered on the ground, and how fairness, transparency and fiduciary controls will be ensured.

4.4 : Para 171: The GEF does not support afforestation. Please delete:

undertaken to ensure free, prior and informed consent. The incentive scheme could be implemented through a tripartite arrangement involving the private sector (who provides the fund and claims the carbon benefit as part of its CSR), the communities who will be in charge of the forest development activities (e.g., forest protection, reforestation/afforestation, forest restoration, and rehabilitation), and the government, which will administer the system, oversee the verification

5- output 3.1.2: Please clarify to whom (which agencies and level of governance) policy recommendations will be targeted at and what is the project strategy to enhance the likelihood that they will be acted upon.

Agency Response

1. The Output wording has been revised as follows: The reference to ?clear mandate? has been removed, and instead it has been added that the project will build on an existing committee and strengthen its capacity on ecosystem management. An additional reference has been added to the Provincial Development Council (PDC).^[1] Based on the more detailed consultations to be held under Output 1.1.1, it will be agreed what will be the mandate of the platform. It is envisioned that the platform will be either of consultative or advisory nature (not a decision-making or legislative body).

2. (i) An overview of training activities is provided in the table below (also included in the CEO ER *Section 3) Proposed alternative scenario*). Under Component 1, training

beneficiaries may overlap in some cases and the trainings can be complementary. However, there is no duplication as the topics are clearly delineated and linked to related assessments to be conducted under the Outputs. The importance of providing these trainings has been highlighted by stakeholders, including DENR, during the consultations. Under Component 2, all formal training activities are grouped under Output 2.1.1. However, some on-the-job training and coaching will be provided under the other Outputs to complement the more formal training. This has been made clearer in the Output description.

(ii) As highlighted in the budget file, trainings will be provided through sub-contracts with NGOs/universities that have been involved in previous similar activities in Bataan or elsewhere, and in close involvement of relevant Government agencies as described in *Section 3) Proposed alternative scenario*. The identification of the NGOs/universities will be done through a competitive process during implementation in line with FAO/DENR procurement requirements. Thus, the potential organizations cannot be named in the CEO ER.

(iii) and (iv) The PMU will ensure that the various training activities are coordinated and incorporated into the agencies' regular programmes for replication and scaling.

Importantly also, as described in Component 1 description, the project will build on existing training materials available instead of developing new ones, where available. An initial scoping of existing training programmes/materials was conducted during PPG.

Training	Targeted stakeholder groups (trainees)	Done by whom (trainers) and Institutionalization
<i>Component 1</i>		
Output 1.1.2-A1: Provision of training to conduct of hydrologic analysis of watersheds	DENR staff and LGUs (mostly Government)	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR training modules
Output 1.1.2-A2: Provision of training to conduct participatory land degradation assessments in selected LGUs	DENR, DA and LGU stakeholders (Government and NGOs)	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR / DA / DILG training modules
Output 1.1.2-A3: Training and assessment on coastal management strategies	DENR and LGU stakeholders (Government and NGOs/community organizations)	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR and university training modules
Output 1.1.3-A2: Training on existing CLUP guidelines and opportunities for harmonization and biodiversity/SLM mainstreaming	LGU stakeholders (Government and NGOs/community organizations)	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR, DILG and university training modules

Output 1.1.4-A1: Training on existing biodiversity assessment and monitoring systems (IIMS, BAMS, LAWIN)	Provincial and local stakeholders (including LGUs, PA management offices, NGOs, etc.)	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR and university training modules
Output 1.1.4-A3: Provide training on the HCVA toolkit	Relevant DENR and LGU stakeholders (related to forests)	Sub-contract with NGO/university in collaboration with SIBOL project ? to be incorporated into regular DENR and university training modules
Output 1.1.4-A4: Training on coastal resources inventory assessment and monitoring systems	Provincial and local stakeholders (LGUs, NGOs, universities)	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR and university training modules
Output 1.1.4-A5: Training on water quality monitoring and water sampling	DENR and LGU staff	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR and LGU training modules
<i>Component 2</i>		
Output 2.1.1-A4: Training/training-of-trainers on: (i) BDFAPs, BDFEs and other sustainable livelihood options, (ii) soil and water conservation and SLM, (iii) links with CLUPs, GMPS and other local plans	LGU extension officers, POs, communities, farmers, fisherfolks LGU, DA, DENR and other Government agency staff will be trained as trainers where feasible, to increase ownership and institutionalization.	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? to be incorporated into regular DENR, DA and LGU training modules
Output 2.1.3: Technical assistance and on-the-job training for implementation of BDFEs, including training to the POs in organizational development, business entrepreneurship, financial management and other related capacity building support to effectively implement and sustain their BDFE activities	Local communities, POs	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? best practices to be shared through DENR
Output 2.1.4: On-the-job training support/ coaching on aspects related to value chain development/ marketing	Local communities, POs	Sub-contract with NGO/university ? best practices to be shared through DENR

3. With regard to monitoring: As described in *Section 3) Proposed alternative scenario*, under Component 1, Output 1.1.4 aims to enhance existing monitoring systems and data in support of biodiversity mainstreaming and decision making related to land use and management. This mostly refers to the existing IIMS, BAMS, and LAWIN systems that will be made more widely accessible to provincial local stakeholders, in particular

LGUs. Community-based monitoring of biodiversity will also be introduced, where possible. Additionally, targeted technical and financial assistance will be provided to expand water quality monitoring capacity in line with the MBSDMP requirements.

Under Component 2, Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.5, participatory monitoring will be implemented with the local communities (in parallel with the implementation of on-the-ground activities) to regularly assess progress and adjust course, if needed. Under Output 2.1.5 specifically, soil quality assessments and monitoring will be conducted, including community-based monitoring.

Under Output 2.1.3 on BDFEs, the project will develop DENR and NCIP capacity to conduct regular monitoring of BDFE activities in order for them to be better able to plan and evaluate the supported BDFEs. The project will also make use of the tools introduced in the DAO 2021-13 (i.e., Appraisal Tool).

4.1 According to DENR Department Administrative Order 21-13 criteria, only enterprises within protected areas, conservation areas or their buffer zones can be officially recognized as BDFEs and may benefit from DENR financial support. However, there is potential to test and apply the policy/concept outside of Protected Areas/Conservation Areas. Thus, the project will support biodiversity-friendly enterprises both within PAs and more generally/in the wider landscape.^[1] This will allow additional POs to benefit from financial and technical assistance to implement biodiversity-friendly livelihoods. This may also form part of the comparative analysis between the effectiveness of the program within and outside a Protected/Conservation area.

4.2 The criteria of BDFEs and BDFAPs are defined in the respective Administrative Orders, as outlined in Box 10 of the CEO ER. BDFE categories include enterprises in the areas of (i) Sustainable Agriculture, (ii) Sustainable Fisheries, (iii) Sustainable Forestry, (iv) Manufacturing (such as dried fish and food processing), and (v) Services (such as agri-tourism and community-based ecotourism). The DAO defines BDFEs as an enterprise that *involves the utilization of resources leaning towards sustainability and further enhancement of resources in which the community will have an increased appreciation of biodiversity through its ecosystem services.* BDFAPs (in the draft AO) are defined as *practices that use traditional and modern technologies, and agriculture, fishery, agroforestry and multi-cropping management techniques to contribute in the maintenance of ecosystem resilience; protect biodiversity reserves and sanctuaries including agriculture-important species, habitat networks and biological corridors; facilitate regeneration of natural habitat; protect watersheds and wild habitat against conversion to other uses; using low-input or less environmentally damaging systems that reduce soil erosion and water run-off; and adopt the principles of sustainable livestock and poultry production and use of water, and fishery resources. These practices also aim to increase soil fertility and productivity, balance insect population*

and reduce air, soil and water pollution that affect important habitats of plants and animals.?

In line with this, the project does not assume an automatic link between livelihood interventions and biodiversity benefits. [JEA1] [AJ2] Rather, the project specifically targets livelihood interventions that are beneficial to biodiversity as outlined in the definitions above. According to the DAO 2021-13, in order to be recognized as biodiversity-friendly enterprise, the enterprise shall be measured against the ecological, economic, equity and legal standards. Each standard shall be measured based on identified indicators and parameters specified in the appraisal tool (Annex F of the DAO). Existing good practices, guidelines, and principles on biodiversity conservation and management will be taken into account in drafting these standards and processes, including a publication developed under the UNDP-GEF Small Grants Programme, *?Scaling Up Biodiversity Friendly Enterprises? (2020).*

Additionally, a process and criteria for the selection of participating POs and communities for livelihood/sustainable management activities under Component 2 is described in the CEO ER as part of Output 2.1.1 (including the use of the BDFE Appraisal tool). This will include biodiversity and socio-economic criteria.

4.3 In line with FAO's Operational Partners Implementation Modality requirements, the financial assistance will not be provided as grants, but rather through sub-contracts with POs upon their proposals (with clear deliverables, financial plan and outputs). A competitive process will be ensured in line with DENR's procurement/fiduciary rules and regulations and in line with the selection criteria mentioned above. The above-mentioned criteria for beneficiary selection from the CEO ER (Box 12/para 139) will help to ensure fairness and transparency, including the participation of vulnerable groups, women, and IPs.

4.4 Well noted. The word 'afforestation' has been removed from the CEO ER.

5. The policy recommendations will be targeted at (1) the Manila Bay Mandamus Agencies (central level agencies), and (2) the LGUs. The close ownership of DENR and close engagement of other Government agencies is expected to increase the likelihood that the recommendations will be acted upon. Additionally, bi-annual learning sessions and annual learning visits will also help gain the interest and commitment of relevant stakeholders.

[1] The wider landscape will be in Buffer Zones as defined under RA 7586 or the National Integrated Protected Areas System Act of 1992, as amended by RA 11038 or the Expanded NIPAS Act of 2018, as well as other conservation areas either managed by the LGUs or POs.

[JEA1] Moreover, BDFE makes use of the three pillars of sustainability + legality as its overall standards mirroring what has been described by Walton et al. in 2014 as the recurring themes to effectively scale up Marine Protected Areas. This, in turn, will ensure that the goals of MPAs in conservation and development are being met through the effective implementation of the program.

[AJ2] I haven't added this as I believe it is not directly responding to the comment and may trigger additional questions ? but good to know.

[1] The PDC assists local legislative bodies in setting the direction of economic and social development and coordinating development efforts in their respective territorial jurisdictions. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1991/07/23/executive-order-no-471-s-1991/>

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/15/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS1/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 1/11/2022- Thank you for the revisions. However, the contribution from co-financing is still not presented. Please revise.

JS 12/15/2021- No, the elaboration does not present the role of co-financing and the scenario without the GEF investment does not reflect the strong baseline presented in the sections dedicated to the baseline and II.6 on coordination. Please revise, providing a more realistic/nuanced "without the GEF" scenario and clarifying the role of co-financing in the scenario with the GEF.

Agency Response

RE 1/11/2022: The contribution from co-financing has now been added in the "GEF alternative scenario column" of the table under *Section 5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning* of the CEO ER.

The *Section 5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning* in the CEO ER has been revised and additional information added on the GEF increment.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/15/2021-

1-Please see comments on core indicators in the dedicated comment box above and address as needed here.

2-Please clarify what project activities are to enhance the management effectiveness, as measured by the METT, of the two targeted protected areas.

Agency Response

1-See response above (point 7).

2-The following project outputs/activities will contribute to enhancing the management effectiveness / METT scores of the two target PAs:

- Output 1.1.3: Through the harmonization of plans (including between PA plans and CLUPs, FLUPs, local community plans etc.) and biodiversity mainstreaming, it is anticipated that LGUs will increase their support to PA management/ BD conservation under their jurisdiction, and local communities' engagement will be increased. This will contribute to METT scores *3. Law Enforcement, 21. Planning for land and water use, ecosystem services and species conservation, 23. Indigenous people, and 24. Local communities' engagement.*

- Outputs 2.1.1-2.1.4: An estimated 540 PA occupants (50% women) will be implementing biodiversity-friendly practices as a result of the project. At least 3 PACBRMA holders will be strengthened in order to improve participation of community organization in PA management. Ecotourism activities will be monitored in line with standards and approaches of BDFEs. These outputs will directly contribute to METT scores *25. Economic benefit and 30. Overall condition of biodiversity.*[JEA1] [AJ2]

- Under Output 1.1.4, the project will enhance multi-stakeholder monitoring systems (such as IIMS, BAMS, LAWIN) for biodiversity monitoring and will provide training and implementation support. This will contribute to METT score *9. Resource inventory.*

- Under Output 3.1.1, 4,460 household members (50% women, 975 indigenous peoples) will be reached by Information, Education and Communication (IEC) activities raising awareness on the protection status and biodiversity values of BNP. This will contribute to METT score 20. *Education and awareness.*

[JEA1]Contributions to SDGs may also be cited?

[AJ2]Reference to SDGs is included in Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021-

1- Please see question on trainings and monitoring institutionalization in the comment box related to the alternative scenario above, and address as needed here.

Agency Response

1- Addressed above (point 3).

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/15/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021- We note that consultation were held virtually and were limited with local communities due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

1- Some of the stakeholders identified as key in the PIF seem not to be reflected in the Stakeholder engagement plan: ICOMOS Philippines, Bataan Coastal Care Foundation, Inc. (BCCFI).

Please explain.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

1- Regarding ICOMOS Philippines, no cultural heritage sites/UNESCO sites were identified in the project target area during the more detailed analysis during PPG. Thus, ICOMOS Philippines was no longer included as a stakeholder in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the CEO ER.

BCCFI are included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, as BCCF? (now changed to BCCFI). They are also included in the baseline section and the alternative scenario. As mentioned in the CEO ER, the project will facilitate a consultation meeting with members of the BCCFI and other similarly intentioned organizations and discuss revival of BCCFI and their potential role in BDFAPs/BDFEs.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/15/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/15/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/15/2021-

1-The portal entry and the PRODOC state that "climate risk screening was conducted during PIF development and is attached as a separate document in the GEF Portal" but we failed to locate the document. Please upload it with the next submission.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response 1-The climate risk screening has been re-uploaded in the GEF Portal.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021-

1- It seems that the PMU is not to be located full time in Bataan when the entire project will take place there. Please clarify and thoroughly justify if the PMU is indeed not to be full time in Bataan.

2- On coordination with other projects, please see the two GEF-7 projects mentioned in the comment box related to the baseline, and consider adding them in the list of projects to be coordinated with.

Agency Response

1- BMB has significant experience in GEF project management and the hosting of the PMU within BMB will enable important synergies with BMB operations, including for administrative tasks and financial management (similar to other GEF projects). BMB, particularly its Coastal and Marine Division has initiated coordination meetings with Foreign Assisted Projects in 2021 which is planned to be continued in 2022 to ensure that there is no overlapping of efforts and projects complement each other. Nevertheless, the importance of locating (part of) the PMU in Bataan Province is recognized. Thus, a satellite PMU office is planned to be established within the PENRO office in Bataan (Pilar Municipality). The National Project Coordinator will be based at the BMB office, with frequent travel to the Bataan satellite office as well as regular dialogue and validation.

2- Reference to these two projects has been added as explained above.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/15/2021-Cleared.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 12/15/2021-Cleared.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021-We note the project is rated High risk. We also note the attached ESMF and IPP, notably that limited consultations during PPG because of COVID-related restrictions means that FPIC will have to be secured at the onset of project implementation.

1- Please upload the final version of the IPP. The version uploaded contains some tracked changes.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response 1-The final version of the IPP has been uploaded and also inserted in the ProDoc (Annex J)
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021-

1 - Project M&E budget is at 6.6% of GEF project financing, above the observed 5% average in the GEF portfolio, when it is not clear that there are particular M&E challenges in this project. Please reduce to 5% (\$136,552) or under.

2- The MTR is planned for the third quarter of the third year of this 4-year project, which would be too late to course correct. Please revise the timeframe of the MTR.

Agency Response

1- The M&E budget has been reduced to USD 136,350 by moving 50% of the KM & M&E Specialist and other KM-related budget under Output 3.1.1.

2- Thank you. This has been changed to 4th quarter of Year 2.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/15/2021-Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1 /11 /2022 - Cleared. We note the adequate ToRs for project staff charged to both PMC and project components.

JS 12/15/2021-

1-Budget:

1.1 Please see comment on M&E budget and revise accordingly

1.2 - We note that some staff carrying out general project management duties (e.g. program assistant) and equipment linked to overall project management (e.g. office utilities) are charged to components and not to PMC, when PMC is not exhausted.

Currently PMC is at 4.76% of GEF project financing and could be increased to 5% (\$135,552), if co-financing amount dedicated to PMC is also set to at least 5% of project co-financing (\$853,972) to maintain proportionality between the GEF and co-financing contributions to PMC. Only after PMC have been fully utilized can project staff be charged to both PMC and project components. If there is such cross charge, please provide a clear link (in the case of good or services) or Terms of Reference (in the case of project staff) describing unique outputs/deliverables under the respective components on which they are charged.

Agency Response

1.1 - A revised budget has been uploaded to the Portal.

1.2 - Current PMC is 5% of sub-total (for both the GEF grant and co-financing). We understand that the Portal does not allow PMC greater than 5% of the sub-total. Hence, we were unable to increase this amount. We have, however, adjusted the Terms of Reference of the Project Assistant to describe the outputs/deliverables to which this position contributes. The office utilities have been moved to PMC while slightly reducing the Project Coordinator's portion under PMC.

Additionally, a note has been added in the budget file, line 94 (computers), to explain that these serve the implementation of Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.3, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, and 3.1.1.

The revised TOR of the Project Assistant are pasted below for reference (from Annex L of ProDoc).

?The Project Assistant will be responsible for the following tasks:

? Provide organizational, operational and logistical support related to project execution to the NPC, PMU staff and consultants as per DENR and FAO guidelines and procedures;

? Assist in the delivery of project outputs and activities, in particular the training activities under Outputs 1.1.2, 1.1.3, the on-the-ground implementation under Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.4, as well as systematization of knowledge under Output 3.1.1;

? Keep record of project documents;

? Ensure that all logistical arrangements are carried out smoothly, in particular for the above-mentioned outputs;

? Assist PMU staff and consultants in the organization of project activities, meetings and events, as well as travel arrangements;

? Assist the NPC in preparing and monitoring consultancy contracts and sub-agreements for the sound implementation of the project outputs;

? Assist the NPC in preparation and updating of project work plans and reports in collaboration with FAO and WWF.

? Maintain up-to-date accurate logistics records i.e. database of all items purchased and keep track of them on regular basis.

Supervise all admin related matters of project set-up and daily management of project activities, personnel, assets, inputs, and contracts as well as operations.?

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022 - Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021-

- 1- Please see comments on core indicator further up in this review sheet and address accordingly in the Results Framework.
- 2- Please provide mid-term and final targets from the PA METT scores.
- 3- Please clarify how Core Indicators 3, 5 and 11 will be measured in practice (means of verification).

Agency Response

- 1- See response above. Corresponding adjustments have been made in the Results Framework.
- 2- Mid-term and final targets have been added in the Results Framework for both BNP and RPL, as follows.
 - BNP: increase by 2 points (69) at mid-term and 4 points (71) by end-of-project.
 - RPL: increase by 2 points (72) at mid-term and 4 points (74) by end-of-project.These are considered realistic but ambitious targets based on recent decreases in METT scores over the period 2016-2020 (for BNP) and 2018-2021 (for RPL).
- 3- The means of verification of Core Indicators 3, 5 and 11 has been added in the Results Framework (Annex A1 of the ProDoc / Annex A of the CEO ER), as explained below:
 - Core Indicator 3 (restoration): The means of verification will be the project's M&E survey as indicated under Outcome 2.1 in the Results Framework. The M&E survey is part of the KM & M&E Specialist's Terms of Reference.
 - Core Indicator 5 (marine habitat excl. MPAs): The means of verification will be copies of plans and related official documents, as indicated under Outcome 1.1 in the Results Framework.
 - Core Indicator 11 (beneficiaries): This indicator will be measured through the M&E beneficiary surveys and relevant project reports as indicated under Components 2 and 3 in the Results Framework.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/11/2022- Cleared.

JS 12/15/2021-

1- The response to Germany's question on the mandate of the multi-stakeholder platform is not adequate. Please address directly the question of the mandate (is it more than consultative?) and how it will be derived in practice.

2- In the response to UK comments, please clarify in the response matrix if what was proposed to coordinate with 10568 for the PPG phase has indeed been done (participation in each other's PPG inception workshops, etc.). Please also clarify if what was announced to coordinate during the implementation phase will indeed be done.

Agency Response

1- A response to the question on the mandate has been added in the ProDoc/CEO ER, see also response under point 3. above.

2- PPG phase: The focal person of DENR-BMB for both PPGs (1) participated in the respective inception and validation workshops, and (2) shared draft documents with each of the PPG teams. In discussion with DENR, additional meetings between the project design teams were not considered necessary as the coordination mechanism was ensured through the National Steering Committee that is in place for all GEF projects in the Philippines. In turn, a meeting was organized with the UNDP GEF-6 PEMSEA project, which has the closest linkages with the GEF-7 Bataan project (as it relates to Manila Bay).

Implementation phase: Stakeholders expressed the view that coordination should be done as part of the existing coordination mechanism, i.e. as part of the existing National Project Steering Committee (PSC) for all GEF projects in the Philippines (as referred to in the Institutional arrangements section of the CEO ER). Also, other GEF projects were identified as having closer linkages with the GEF-7 Bataan project, so a separate coordination mechanism with the CI project was not considered justified.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 12/15/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 12/15/2021-Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 12/15/2021-Cleared.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/28/2022 - The project is recommended for endorsement.

JS 1/26/2022 - Please address the remaining comment of the first comment box (budget readability in portal) and resubmit.

JS 1/24/2022 - Please address the two comments of the first comment box and resubmit.

JS 1/11/2021 - Not at this stage, please address the two remaining comments above (METT score in portal entry, role of co-financing in incremental reasoning section) and resubmit.

JS 12/15/2021 - Not at this stage, please address comments above and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/18/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	1/24/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/26/2022

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations