

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

Basic Information

GEF ID

10704

Countries

Philippines

Project Title

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

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 689681

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

(Karrer, Nov 3, 2020). No.

Co-financing: Please use the drop-down menu and select either “investment mobilized” or “recurrent expenditure”. Please also provide definition used to differentiate between “investment mobilized” and “recurrent expenditure” and revise the provided information against that criteria. Please clarify if the full US\$ 15M co-financing is “in-kind, recurrent expenditure” (i.e. operations costs)?

(Karrer, Nov 4, 2020). Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency response 5 November 2020

The co-financing budget will be from the 'recurrent expenditure' of the Government of Philippines. "Recurrent expenditure" of the government is considered to be the "normal" annual expenses such as salaries, operational costs, etc., that is budgeted and utilised for an extended period through its national budgeting process. The entire USD 15.5m co-finance by the Government of Philippines is an in-kind 'recurrent expenditure' that will be further refined with details explicitly provided during the proposal development.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020).) No.

The vast majority of the hectares that will benefit from this project are noted as “coastal and marine seascape with improved management as measured by biodiversity species richness parameters.” However, despite these marine and coastal benefits, the project has a heavy terrestrial focus. For example, the project threats and root causes section discusses logging, wood harvesting, hunting and collecting terrestrial plants without explaining the impacts on coastal and marine ecosystems. Further, the project activities are tied to land-use and landscape management without explanation of how they connect to coastal and marine ecosystems. Please revise the PIF to explain the linkages to coastal and marine ecosystem priorities.

Component 1 is heavy on capacity building, which typically means training and raising awareness activities. There needs to be more focus on action on the ground. For example, Output 1.2 will establish a platform. This platform needs to be operationalized. Output 1.3 notes plans and recommendations will be provided. These needs to be adopted and implemented. Output 1.4 will prepare plans. These plans need to be approved and implemented. While some capacity building activities are fine, there needs to be much more focus on actionable outputs.

The intent of Component 2 is unclear. As stated it seems to have a very similar purpose as Component 1. Both are integrating biodiversity into landscape and seascape management. Component 1 has clear outputs working with the LGUs to integrate conservation while the focus of Component 2 is unclear. There seem to be a few options for the focus of Component 2:

- 1) All the outputs (except 2.1, which seems duplicative with Component 1) are focused on working with the communities and the private sector suggesting this is the focus for Component 2;
- 2) Outputs 2.2 and 2.4 focus on the two protected areas suggesting this is the focus of Component 2; however the other outputs are not focused on the 2 protected areas
- 3) The indicators noted under Outcome 2 suggest that the purpose of Component 2 is to identify and recommend protected areas for biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices; however, these are not stated in Component 2 or Outcome 2.

Please clarify the purpose of Component 2 and Outcome 2 so that they are clear and distinct from Component 1.

More specifically, Output 2.1 (protected areas management... integrated into...land use) seems duplicative with the Outputs under Component 1, which are integrating biodiversity into land use. Output 2.2 states that farmers and fisherfolk practice biodiversity friendly agriculture and sustainable fisheries, but not how that will occur. Will there be trainings, incentives, regulations that lead to this outcome of farmers and fishers practicing biodiversity friendly agriculture and sustainable fisheries? Output 2.3 is also unclear. It notes sustainable livelihood options...” Presumably these will be developed – please specify and ensure relevant to Component 2. And please clarify how these livelihoods will *replace* and not simply *add to* existing unsustainable livelihoods.

Once the components are better defined, the Theory of Change, which is essentially the Results Framework, will need updating. In addition, the linkages between Outputs, Outcomes, and Components need to be noted (i.e. arrows) in the diagram. And the problems and risks need to include storms and flooding. Please consider STAP guidance: <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change->

to include storms and flooding. Please consider STR guidance: <https://www.stapgei.org/theory-change-primer#:~:text=The%20primer%20provides%20a%20brief,do%20a%20Theory%20of%20Change>.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020) No.

The concern regarding Components 1 and 2 being indistinguishable remains. The Agency replied that the difference is Component 1 is working on capacity building; and mainstreaming biodiversity into land management while Component 2 is creating interventions on the ground, including sustainable land use management plans. This explanation indicates that both are mainstreaming biodiversity into land use management plans. In addition, as noted in Table B Component 1 is "mainstreaming biodiversity and sustainable land management in production landscapes and seascapes" and Outcome 1.1 is "Cross-sectoral land use plans and management frameworks". Similarly, Component 2 is "Biodiversity mainstreaming and sustainable land management interventions".

Please revise to distinguish the two components and outcomes. From the outputs it seems one different is that Component 1 is focused on working with governments (LGUs, DENR) on capacity building; whereas, Component 2 is focused on working with communities and businesses to provide alternative livelihoods. Both indicate they will pursue integrated management plans with biodiversity (Outputs 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.4) which need to be under either Component 1 OR Component 2. Please resolve the duplicity.

Output 2.1.1 is unclear as to how the farmers and fishers would shift their practices - would they work with government to adopt and implement management plans?

(Karrer Oct 27) No.

The differences are still unclear. The titles of components and outcomes have not been edited to clarify the differences. You noted that component 1 is about capacity building; component 2 about management plan changes. Please edit the components and outcomes to reflect these differences. Further, the outputs for component 2 include capacity building activities, which you indicated is the focus of component 1. Please edit to be clear.

(Karrer Oct 28) No.

The lack of distinction between Components 1 and 2 remains. Both outcomes are still focused on integrated plans. Component 1 outputs and indicators include not only capacity building, but also the development of integrated plans. Integrated plans are also noted in Component 2. Choose one or the other (previously you noted that Component 2 addressed plans) and ensure the plans are only in that component. Alternatively, if plans need to be in both components then you need to determine how the components are distinct. Output 2.1.2 is capacity building and, therefore, should be in Component 1. Please revise.

(Karrer Oct 30, 2020). Cleared. During PPG please ensure the project is building capacity and developing and implementing plans (e.g. Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2). Note that the indicator iv. Number of community institutions... seems more appropriate for Component 2 which is more localized.

Agency Response

The Component 1 and Component 2 and their respective outputs are different, yet complementary and interlinked. Component 1 focuses on creating an enabling environment for mainstreaming biodiversity and sustainable land management into productions landscapes and seascapes, through capacity building of relevant institutions and individuals, which will result in the revision and harmonization of different land use plans that will be adopted and implemented.

Component 2 pertains to actual interventions on the ground in key biodiversity areas through an integrated approach across the production

landscapes, including protected areas, and hence not specifically focused on PAs. These interventions include the identification, adoption, and uptake of biodiversity friendly agriculture and sustainable fisheries, identification of sustainable livelihood activities that reduce pressure on the biodiversity and ecosystems as well as sustainable land management practices, specifically in the upland areas, to address soil erosion and excessive sedimentation downstream in the riparian areas and coastal zones to reduce impacts on the coastal and marine biodiversity. Further, the 12 landscape level land use plans (mentioned in the indicator), as well as the harmonized resource management plans, that will be approved and implemented, will address a number of challenges and concerns related to the coastal and marine biodiversity conservation identified in the PIF. In this regard, relevant sections in the PIF, incl. Part 1 Table B, have been revised for clarity across the different outcomes and outputs. The theory of change has also been revised in line with the changes.

There were inconsistencies in the GEBs that the project will contribute (sections B and F). It was reported that 177,000 ha of MPAs will be under improved management. However, the correct size is 592 ha covering MPAs and mangroves, wetlands, etc, in Bataan municipal waters (176,408 ha). Revisions have been made in Part 1. Table B indicators and Part 1.F to reflect this change.

Agency Response 25 Oct 2020

The project as a whole focuses on mainstreaming biodiversity, as reflected in all components of the PIF. This will be implemented through three inter-connected components focused on institutional/individual capacity strengthening of all relevant stakeholders under Component 1; implementation of biodiversity friendly interventions and sustainable land management under Component 2; and knowledge management and scale-up of project lessons in Component 3. Table B, and corresponding activities in the project narrative, are revised to distinguish the different Components, along with the outcomes and outputs. Under Output 2.1.1 (now 2.1.2), communities will practice sustainable natural resource management that is consistent with the harmonised land use plans, developed under outcome 1, with the government authorities and other relevant partners. Existing community institutions and individuals will be strengthened, and new ones established, and trained to implement these biodiversity friendly interventions.

Agency Response 28 October 2020

The titles of the components and outcomes (1&2) have been further revised to highlight the differences between the two. Component 1 which focuses on capacity building is titled *Institutional and regulatory **capacity building** to mainstream biodiversity and sustainable land management in production landscapes and seascapes*, whereas Component 2, related to on-ground interventions, is titled ***Demonstration of sustainable natural resource management interventions** to deliver global environment benefits* Accordingly, an output under component 2 related to capacity building has been adjusted and moved to component 1.

All other outputs under Component 2 are related to site level interventions on sustainable livelihoods and improved land management.

Agency response 30 Oct 2020

Components 1&2 and the corresponding outcomes and outputs have been revised, where needed, to differentiate the geographical focus and related activities under the two components

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No.

Please provide a budget break-down by output so that we have a better understanding of the relative focus of efforts.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020). Cleared.

Agency Response The output-wise breakdown will be prepared and submitted during the PPG phase

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No. The core indicators only include the PAs totaling 19,211ha. The area that will be impacted by the revised land use plans also needs to be included. In email communication FAO indicated the total area would be 242,429ha. This larger total is also noted in Table B.

Please ensure that the full land area that is expected to be directly impacted by improved land use and other activities is included in the targets. This includes implementation of policy that is supported directly by GEF funds, project co-finance or government expenditures within the period of the project to implement. Note that currently the return on investment from a hectare perspective is quite low (\$11/ha), which may be because only the coastal and marine areas and protected areas are included in the core indicators. Additional terrestrial areas that will be directly impacted by project activities need to be included as well.

Please explain how the core indicator values were calculated.

The discussion in section 6) GEBs does not adequately discuss the range of GEBs. In particular sea turtles and coral reefs are not noted even though these marine animals and habitats are noted in the Project Justification section. In addition this section notes carbon sequestration as a GEB; however, this benefit is not noted as a core indicator. Please reconcile.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020) Cleared. During PPG a clear explanation needs to be provided as to how the core indicators were calculated.

Agency Response

Agency response

There were some inconsistencies in the project's contribution to GEB in sections B and F of the PIF. The MPA under improved management

was reported as 202,544ha and 177,000ha respectively. The correct area of MPAs under improved management is 592 ha and mangroves, wetlands, etc in Bataan municipal waters covering 176,408 ha.

The terrestrial PAs under improved management is 19,211 ha (these are terrestrial forestlands under PAs) and landscapes under improved practices is 46,218ha (terrestrial forestlands outside PAs). In total, the project will contribute to GEB in 242,429 ha.

Biodiversity conservation and ecosystem restoration as well as sustainable land management activities will undoubtedly result in increased carbon stocks contributing to climate change mitigation. However, as these are co-benefits of biodiversity mainstreaming interventions, they have not been included in the core indicator.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No.

As noted above, the explanation of threats and root causes is heavily focused on threats to terrestrial ecosystems. In fact the second sentence references the global ‘Assessment of threats to terrestrial protected areas’ reflecting a terrestrial focus for the project. Yet, the vast majority of the hectares that will benefit from this project are noted as “coastal and marine seascape with improved management as measured by biodiversity species richness parameters.” If the MPAs are the main focus, then the discussion of threats, such as logging, unsustainable farming and hunting and collecting terrestrial plants, need to explain how these activities are threats to the coastal and marine seascape.

The Project Justification, Biodiversity: The Project Site section needs editing to clarify the biodiversity benefits. Section e) Specific Richness Map of Bivalves does not state the biodiversity value of the region. Section f) Lowest Count in Fecal Coliform also does not indicate how meeting standards makes the region biodiversity rich.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020). Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response

Revisions have been made in the PIF to reflect the inconsistencies reported in the GEB. The MPA coverage will be 592ha, whereas the Bataan municipal waters covering wetlands, mangroves and other important biodiversity areas are 176,408ha.

Further, as the project will not be assessing the species richness map of bivalves and the same has been removed as an indicator. Similarly, assessing coliform count in Manila Bay area is not under the direct purview of the project. However, since the project supports the Mandamus Bay Agencies in meeting their obligations under the Strategic Plan, including assessment of coliform count, there will be indirect support through capacity building of the agencies, including coordination capacity of the DENR.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No. See previous points.

(Karrer, Oct 30, 2020). Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No.

Please clarify how the various stakeholder groups were engaged in PIF development.

There is reference to fishers and seascapes in the PIF and seascapes; however, the focus of activities is clearly on land use issues. Please clarify in the PIF how the project activities are relevant to fishers.

LGUs are important stakeholders for this project and need to be included in the stakeholder involvement plan.

Please identify and include CSOs in the stakeholder plans. Birdlife International is noted in the text. Consider other CSOs and ensure they are included.

(Karrer, Oct 20, 2020). Cleared.

During PPG the various stakeholders need to be consulted, their relevance assessed (and explained) and clear plans for their engagement established.

The Tourism Sector is noted under the Project Role column; however, it should be listed as a stakeholder group and engagement explained during PPG.

Agency Response

- A series of consultations were held with the Biodiversity Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (BMB-DENR) and the Bureau of Soils and Water Management of the Department of Agriculture (BSWM-DA), who are also both part of the technical working group in the implementation of the Operational Plan for the Manila Bay Coastal Strategy (OPMBCS) 2017-2022. Such consultations ensure that planned interventions in the proposal are aligned and complementary to the OPMBCS. At the local level, online consultations were also held with DENR field offices as well as with representatives both from the provincial and local government of Bataan. The identification of stakeholders at the local level were initially done in consultation with BMB and BSWM. The contents of the PIF was also presented and validated through an online consultation with representatives from the national agencies and the local government of Bataan. All consultations were also participated by representatives from the Foreign-Assisted and Special Project Service of the DENR/ Philippines GEF Operational Focal Point. A total of 10 online

consultations have been undertaken during the PIF development.

- With regard to the stakeholder involvement plan, partnership with the LGUs are well recognized and given due consideration as stated in the 4th row on the matrix of key stakeholders (Provincial, City and Municipal LGUs), responsibilities, and roles matrix. The LGUs are key partners both in the planning and implementation of interventions identified in this proposal. CSOs and private sector have also identified in the plan, specifically the Bataan Coastal Care Foundation, Inc. (BCCFI) and the Philippine Business for Social Progress (BCCFI). Additional CSOs/ NGOs can be further explored in the PPG and implementation stages.
- As advised, the role and responsibility of the tourism sector as a stakeholder has been revised in the PIF.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, 2020). No. The PIF discusses engagement of women in decision-making in the region; however, it does not discuss the role of women in project-related activities, specifically land use. Please provide preliminary insights into the role of women and how they are likely to be affected by project activities.

The gender analysis needs to be planned for PPG phase and not be delayed to project implementation.

(Karrer, Oct 20, 2020). No.

The PIF noted the importance of engaging women in decision-making and project activities; however, it also needs to provide at least a brief statement regarding the role of women in the various land use activities under discussion for the project. It also needs to discuss how women are likely to be affected by the proposed measures to incorporate biodiversity into land use management, capacity building and improved sustainable livelihoods. During PPG a more thorough analysis will need to be done. At this time it is important to demonstrate an understanding of the role of women in the project-related activities and how they may be affected. Planning on attendance in decision-making is not sufficient; the project needs to consider the impacts of the project on women and how to maximize benefits and minimize losses.

(Karrer, Oct 27, 2020). Cleared. The PPG gender analysis will need to start by assessing the role of women in the relevant sectors, including

(Natter, Oct 27, 2020). Cleared. The PPG gender analysis will need to start by assessing the role of women in the relevant sectors, including agriculture.

Agency Response

Agency Response

The relevant section has been revised to include women's role in project activities. A Gender Assessment Plan will be prepared during the PPG phase.

Agency Response 25 Oct 2020

The project design will take into account gender-responsive activities in all phases of the project, from planning to implementation and this is reflected in the revised section.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No. Fishers, farmers and tourism operators are noted in the text; however, the private sector engagement section only discusses foundations that receive funding from corporations. The intent of private sector engagement is not for funding, but rather to work with them to shift toward sustainable business practices.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020). Cleared. During PPG the businesses and their engagement need to be detailed.

Agency Response

Agency Response

The private sector engagement section has been revised and more details provided on the areas of engagement with the private sector at the local and the national levels.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No.

Climate change impacts and project plans to address these impacts are discussed in the PIF and more specifically in the Climate Risk Screening. During PPG further consideration will need to be given to these concerns. Please refer to STAP guidance: (<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>).

As described in the PIF, COVID19 has resulted in greater pressures on landscapes as coastal residents lost their source of incomes and have resorted to illegal fishing and unsustainable land uses. As a result the project plans “to explore multiple measures to strengthen safety nets and promote a local green economy... During PPG the project needs to further consider the impacts of COVID, including related to farmers, fishers, and tourism, and how these can be addressed by the project.

The PIF discusses the possible implications of COVID for project processes, such as the design and implementation of workshops as well as the possible diversion of government financing. The PIF also needs to consider the availability of technical expertise.

There are two areas the PIF does not sufficiently address: 1) the possibility of emerging infectious diseases in the future, which require increasing the resilience of the ecologic and socio-economy systems; and, 2) *opportunities* to build back better post-COVID and how this project might contribute to these efforts.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020). Cleared. During PPG more consideration needs to be given to the possibility of emerging infectious diseases in the future.

Agency Response

Further to the list of COVID-19 related risks and mitigation measures provided in the PIF, the risks related to ‘1) *the possibility of emerging infectious diseases in the future, which require increasing the resilience of the ecologic and socio-economy systems; and, 2) opportunities to build back better post-COVID and how this project might contribute to these efforts*’ have been included along with mitigation measures.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No.

The Project Justification section notes that the 3 critical government entities are DENR, DA and LGUs; however only DENR and DA are executing agencies. Why are LGUs included as EAs? Even if they are not EAs, the LGUs need to be noted in plans. Please ensure they are included throughout.

Please explain coordination with the *GEF-7 project ID 10532 "Securing Long-Term Sustainability of Multi-functional Landscapes in Critical River Basins of the Philippines"*. Also, please explain plans for coordinating with the Sulu-Celebes LME.

The second sentence in the Coordination section notes that UNIDO and FAO will co-implement the project, which needs correcting.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020). Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response

- BMB and BSWM are the implementing agencies for this proposed project and LGUs are considered as key partners both in the development and on-ground implementation of the project.
- With reference to the GEF-7 project ID 10532 *"Securing Long-Term Sustainability of Multi-functional Landscapes in Critical River Basins of the Philippines"*, coordination and complementation of activities will be facilitated since both agencies (DENR-BMB and DA-BSWM) are involved in this project. The same applies for the *Sulu Sulawesi LME* project, in which the BMB-DENR is one of the identified executing agencies for the Philippines component. A coordination mechanism, through a project board and a technical working group, with representatives/ membership from these agencies will be established in order to facilitate the following: (i)

close coordination and linkages between the project activities and the relevant interventions of its agencies (including the two above GEF projects); (ii) exchange of information and knowledge between the project and the agency activities; (iii) sustainability of key project outcomes, including scaling up and replication of innovative practices; and (iv) provide oversight and assurance of the quality of project outputs and complementation to existing agency initiatives.

Accordingly, the section on coordination has been revised and the abovementioned points incorporated. The sentence related to coordination with UNIDO has been deleted

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No.

The knowledge management section is well articulated; however, please clarify how best practices will be shared with stakeholders listed in the stakeholder section. Also please discuss sharing experiences with relevant projects, particularly *GEF-7 project ID 10532 "Securing Long-Term Sustainability of Multi-functional Landscapes in Critical River Basins of the Philippines"* and the Sulu-Celebes LME. Much more detail will be needed in the Pro Doc.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020). Cleared. More detail will need to be provided in the Pro Doc.

Agency Response

All stakeholders listed above will be involved and consulted at different stages of the project, including in development of the knowledge management and communication plans and in the monitoring and evaluation framework. Innovative learnings from the project will be shared with stakeholders through the following: (i) establishment of an online portal on project learnings and exchange of good practices (ii); conduct of national conference to showcase best practices to share and also learn from other related projects and initiatives; (iii) provision of technical, coordination assistance, and capacity building activities; and (iv) presentation/updating (inception, midterm, and final) and reporting to the stakeholders on the progress of the project. In addition to the above, the project will also share lessons and experiences with other GEF supported projects to be implemented in Philippines, including GEF 7 project *ID 10532 "Securing Long-Term Sustainability of Multi-functional Landscapes in Critical River Basins of the Philippines"* and the GEF-Sulu Sulawesi LME as well as ongoing and past GEF supported projects through the technical working group that will be established under the project. With DENR being the key partner for these projects, a common platform for cross-fertilisation of ideas and experiences will be set up and coordinated by the DENR to ensure possible complementarity for more effective results

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 11, 2020). No. Please see the previous points to be addressed.

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2020). No. Please see the previous points to be addressed.

(Karrer, Oct 28, 2020). No. Please see the previous points to be addressed.

(Karrer, Oct 30, 2020). Yes.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/11/2020	10/21/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2020	10/26/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2020	10/28/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2020	10/30/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2020	11/4/2020

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The project *Sustainable Management of Natural Resources towards Rehabilitation and Preservation of the Key Biodiversity Area along Bataan Province to Manila Bay* is designed to mainstream biodiversity and sustainable land management in key biodiversity areas along Bataan province to Manila Bay. The project will result in over 176,000ha of restored land, over 46,000ha of landscape under improved practices, 19,000ha of terrestrial and nearly 600ha of marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness while also pursuing alternative, sustainable livelihoods for communities.

The project is innovative by engaging multiple stakeholders at local to national scales in a “ridge-to-reef” approach to mainstream biodiversity into what has been traditional landscape planning. The project will highlight the connectivity of plans and programs from the various ecological zones, including headwaters to the floodplains, to the coastal area, and on to the marine area. The ecosystems-based and cross-sectoral framework will ensure connectivity across the watershed. In addition, the highly participatory approach is unique among LGUs nationally and will serve as an important model for promoting cross-sector stakeholder engagement and public-private partnerships as businesses and CSOs work closely with government on project activities.

The key elements for sustainability found in this project are: a) the strong support, participation, and commitment of public and private sector stakeholders; b) the existence of organizations with relevant mandates at sub-provincial to national levels; c) the presence of an integrated ridge-to-reef management plan and implementation mechanisms; and, d) the improved technical capacity of the provincial LGUs with support from DENR-BMB and DA-BSWM. The issuance of a DENR Administrative Order will further help institutionalize the adoption of the capacity building supported by this project. With regard to financial sustainability, \$15,500,000 of co-financing is being provided by government partners indicating long-term commitments. In addition, both the DENR-BMB and the DA-BSWM, which are the executing

agencies for this project, have major roles in the implementation of the existing *2017-2022 Operational Plan for the Manila Bay Coastal Strategy*, which is likely to provide continued support to project activities.

The project has great potential for scaling-up lessons and best practices through several key partnerships. The project is aligned with the *2017-2022 Operational Plan for the Manila Bay Coastal Strategy*, which will be a means to promote the lessons and tools from this project throughout its extensive regional coverage, as well as nationally through the capacity building of the mandated government agencies. The project is also highly relevant to the League of LGUs, which will also share the project's lessons and good practices. Areas of particular relevance to other landscape projects considering how to mainstream biodiversity are: a) the ecosystems-based and cross-sectoral framework in which the LGUs takes a major role in project implementation; b) the ridge-to-the-reef approach engaging various stakeholders; c) participatory monitoring and assessment tools for the various important biodiversity and natural resources within both the landscapes within and outside the protected Areas and the seascapes within and outside MPAs; d) the soil and water conservation measures with upland and coastal farmers, CSOs, IPs/ICCs, and local communities; e) the biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices and enterprises and value chain; f) the marine turtles program; and g) the participatory biodiversity and environment-related planning processes involving key stakeholders, including the IPs, and women.