



Scaling-up conservation and sustainable management of priority wetlands of the East-Asian Australasian Flyway in the Philippines (PHIL FLYWAY)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11578

Countries

Philippines

Project Name

Scaling-up conservation and sustainable management of priority wetlands of the East-Asian Australasian Flyway in the Philippines (PHIL FLYWAY)

Agencies

ADB

Date received by PM

3/25/2024

Review completed by PM

8/2/2024

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 5/21/24:

Cleared.

HF 4/2/24:

a.) Please refer to subsequent comments regarding revisions to Component to be aligned/eligible under the GEF-8 BD strategy. Further information is requested regarding the project's target sites. Please refer to comments below.

b.) Yes.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

a) Addressed in revised PIF with thanks

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 6/28/2024:

Cleared.

HF 5/21/24:

Further update/revision of project summary will be needed once TOC/Component 1 is further revised, per comments below.

HF 4/2/24:

Please revise/update project summary will be needed once Component 1 is revised, per comments regarding NbS and TOC.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

PIF has been updated as per review comments.

ADB 26 June 2024

Component 1 revised to ?Nature-based solutions (NbS) for conservation of wetlands for migratory waterbirds and for climate adaptation?

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 6/28/2024:

Cleared.

HF 5/21/24:

b.) i.) Revisions noted with thanks. Please update components/activities as needed per further comments/revisions to TOC and obj 1. In addition, given the updates to Outcome 1, please revise Component 1 language to align wetland and migratory bird landscape conservation.

ii. & iii.) Cleared.

HF 4/2/24:

a.) Yes.

b.) i.) Please revise Component 1, Outcome 1, Outputs 1.2 and 1.3 as the term NbS does not clearly convey what is planned for under this component/outcome/output, and alignment with GEF-8 biodiversity strategy entry point is unclear. Further, Output 1.2 is focused on CCA and DRR outcomes/outputs, without a clear BD result. Therefore please revise Component 1 to better align with the GEF-8 BD strategy, including **addressing the drivers** of BD loss in target wetland-scapes.

NbS responds to a problem (not a conservation problem) and proposes nature as the solution (for instance, problem: Storm surges caused by climate change; solution): Protect mangroves and coral reefs. GEF will fund the increment to protect/conservate the mangroves/coral reef taking a landscape/seascape approach, which could also have the co-benefit in terms of storm surge protection.

ii.) Please revise the TOC and Component 1 accordingly to align with the GEF-8 BD strategy.

iii.) Components 1 and 3 should be classified as, Technical Assistance category, otherwise please provide explanation for classification as ?investment?.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

b) i) Revised Outputs 1.2 and 1.3 reflected in PIF

b) ii) Revised in the PIF.

b) iii) Component 1 remains as INV in the PIF because the activities may include civil works and/or purchase of equipment as appropriate to the priority wetland sites after the assessment is completed under Output 1.1. As an example, if there is strong recommendation for sustainable tourism facilities, then a wetland center, washrooms, boardwalks, bird hides, etc. could be constructed; for sustainable agriculture and fisheries, equipment such as smart irrigation system, sensors, drones, etc. could be procured.

We agree that Component 3 be classified as TA because it will develop a platform for investment readiness of the priority wetland sites rather than provide the investment itself.

ADB 26 June 2024

Component 1 revised to ?Nature-based solutions (NbS) for conservation of wetlands for migratory waterbirds and for climate adaptation?

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 5/21/24:

Cleared.

HF 4/2/24:

Please ensure that gender-related results, including the Gender Action Plan, are monitored and reported on.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

Noted, this is indicated in the PIF Attachment 6: Initial Gender Assessment, which gives a high-level context of gender mainstreaming in the Philippines and components to be considered in the gender action plan that will be developed in more detail during the PPG stage.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24:

Yes

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24:

Yes

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24:

Yes

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 6/28/2024:

Cleared at PIF stage. To be addressed at during PPG and at CER: Please clearly articulate the assumptions that form the basis of each causal pathway and are the key leverage points that need to be monitored and used for adaptive management and evaluated (for example: is the 'alternative' source of livelihood actually an alternative and resulting in decreased pressure on the wetland? if not, why or why not? how to adapt approach based on this to be more effective).

HF 5/21/24:

The parenthetical addition of example NbSs in the TOC and component 1 (pasted in below) did not clarify the Theory of Change for these activities. The concept makes a jump between proposed activities (sustainable ag, aquaculture, fisheries and eco-tourism)- in wetlands presumably-and "thereby improving ecosystem integrity". The assumed mechanism of change/causal pathways that would result in project impact is unclear- please describe as this is an important element of a TOC.

Please revise to clearly articulate the critical assumptions about what is expected to happen as a result of proposed project interventions based on what is known/understood about the drivers identified and the situational analysis? And what evidence is this based on? Further, these key assumptions and leverage points should be the basis for project monitoring, adaptive management and evaluation (e.g. ?is what we thought would happen to Y (outcome) if we do X (activity or input) actually happening? Why or why not? What should we do to adapt?)." Please revise/rework. Updates should be made throughout PIF based on this.

"IF appropriate interventions in the form of NbS (such as sustainable agriculture, aquaculture, fisheries and eco-tourism) are successfully implemented in the priority wetlands thereby improving their ecosystem integrity while ensuring the sustainability of ecosystem goods and services and enhancing and increasing livelihoods, and with the priority wetlands adopted as ?models? for other wetlands,"

HF 4/2/24:

Please revise the TOC and Component 1 accordingly to frame/capture the GEF BD increment and align with the GEF-8 BD strategy per previous comments.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

TOC has been revised accordingly.

ADB 26 June 2024

The TOC text has been updated on the PIF page 15 to clarify that the NbS such as the examples mentioned will address the identified threats/drivers of change, resulting to the target impacts of the project. Component 1 has been revised as per comment to 3.b.1 above.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

HF 6/28/2024:

Cleared

HF 5/21/24:

Inclusions and chart noted. Please revise/update point one of "incrementality through GEF" column per the remaining comments on the TOC for this component of the project.

HF 4/2/24:

Please describe per previous comments.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

The narrative after the TOC in the PIF has been revised to include the incremental cost analysis which at the PIF stage is still relatively high level but will be further expanded and analysed during the PPG stage.

ADB 26 June 2024

Point one under 'incrementality through GEF' has been revised in the PIF.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 6/28/2024:

Cleared.

HF 5/21/24:

b.) Noted, with thanks. Any request for self-execution will only be considered at CER stage. Given PPG and design phase is yet to come, please remove all details related to proposed self-execution this in the PIF as the execution arrangements should not be pre-supposed or approved. Thank you.

HF 4/2/24:

a.) Yes.

b.) The MSP currently notes potential self-execution by ADB. Might this be an error? This is not described nor justified in the section nor is it included in the LOE. Please note, to avoid conflict of interest, or the appearance of conflict of interest, and to build country capacity, self-execution by GEF Implementing Agencies is only to occur in exceptional circumstances once all potential 3rd party options have been exhausted. Please either indicate 'no' for self-execution, or provide further explanation/justification.

c.) Yes.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

b) The section on coordination with other initiatives has been updated. On the matter of execution arrangements, a letter confirming these has been secured from the GEF OFP in consultation with the GEF Executing Entity, the Biodiversity Management Bureau in the DENR. As outlined in the letter, ADB will execute only the procurement element of the project, in coordination with DENR, up to selection - while GEF fund flow (ie payments and disbursements) will be devolved to DENR.

d) For additional information - Output 4 is focused on Knowledge which will be directed through firstly development of a Knowledge Management Plan (Output 4.1) to direct further activities as outlined in the PIF

ADB 26 June 2024

Noted, DENR and ADB will discuss and finalize the implementation arrangements during the project preparation. The narrative has been adjusted. However we are not able to remove / delete the letter from GEF OFP on execution from the Portal. This requires intervention from WB ITS group.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 5/21/24:

Cleared.

HF 4/2/24:

a.) Yes

b.) i.) GEBs: Criteria for RFI sites noted in Annex. Please ensure and describe how each project site meets the criteria for determining 'global biodiversity significance' for a wetland-landscape, examples: a.) Ramsar site; b.) A site that meets Ramsar criteria but hasn't been declared; c.) a Key Biodiversity Area (KBA); d.) A site that meets KBA criteria, even if not yet formally designated.

Please note this must be beyond the biodiversity value of the migratory species that use these sites, but also include the sites themselves. Please revise throughout (including

alignment and site selection criteria and description of BD value).

ii.) Proposed Core Indicator targets: CI 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported 20,000 ha, CI 5.3 Marine OECMs supported is 172,000 ha (good to have marine areas). These two BD relevant targets totaling 188,205 ha appears somewhat low for a \$10 million project investment (\$3 m GEF). Particularly without a better idea of Component 1 activities/approach. Please further explain and consider targeted hectares/sites.

iii.) The CI narrative refers to restoration of the wetland areas. Suggest including CI 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries and mangroves) under restoration.

iv.) The Component 2: indicative target of training participants with at least 30% of women seem low for Philippine context. Please explain why less than 1/2 or revise.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

b.) i.) Table of priority sites in the PIF has been updated with the global biodiversity significance of the wetland sites.

ii.) The Core Indicator targets have been updated in the excel and on the PIF table to include the entire RFI boundaries for the Candaba Wetlands of 9706.83 ha as landscapes under improved practices (CI 4.5), and added 1,911 ha specific site within Candaba Wetlands RFI boundaries as area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration (CI 3.1). In addition, there is a plan for 20,000 ha of mangrove restoration (CI 3.4), which is within the total of 172,007 ha marine area under improved practices (CI 5.4) in Sibugay Wetlands. Lake Mainit is 14,287 ha of landscape also under improved practices (CI 4.5) The total area for the 3 sites is revised to 196,001 ha. With the revised Outputs 1.2 and 1.3, it is clarified that the NbS to be implemented may include civil works and/or purchase of equipment. In addition, the project will leverage on co-financing that will benefit a wider coverage (e.g. co-financing from the proposed Central-Luzon-Pampanga River Floodway Project that will encompass the entire Pampanga River floodplain which includes Candaba Wetlands).

iii) CI indicator table has been updated as suggested.

iv) Adjusted to 50% women participants for Component 2.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) **Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) **Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) **Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

HF 5/22/24:

c.) Cleared. To be addressed during PPG/CER: Policy Coherence: Please further develop mechanisms and activities to increase coherence among policies across sectors to support the conservation of these critical wetland sites and wildlife populations therein. In particular, please note the requirement under section C of the PIF to: **"Confirm if any country policies that might contradict with intended outcomes of the project have been identified, and how the project will address this."** Please address this fully during PPG, incorporate into the project design and incorporate/highlight in in CER.

HF 4/2/24

a & b.) Yes

c.) Please address.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 20204

c.) Yes, the project will improve alignment of national policies, particularly under Component 2, Output 2.3 where the National Wetland Conservation Policy will be supported. The National Wetland Conservation Policy will be the overarching policy with provisions addressing wetland concerns and will complement other existing legislation that has implication on wetlands, conservation and protected areas, biodiversity, natural resource management, ecotourism, indigenous peoples rights, etc. Local policies for on-site management of wetland will be expected to adhere to this national policy.

ADB 26 June 2024

Noted, policy coherence to be addressed during PPG.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 5/22/24:

Cleared.

HF 4/2/24

1.) Please see previous comments on BD strategy alignment. Once addressed, please describe here alignment with GEF-8 BD strategy specifically indicating the entry-points selected and how the design aligns.

2.) Further, in the narrative section BD-3 is indicated however, the GEF financing tables only includes BD-1. Suggest including BD-3 entry point since finance mechanism is one of the major components.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

1) Component 1 on NbS, Component 2 on Governance, and Component 4 on Knowledge Management and Learning are aligned with the GEF-8 BD strategy Objective 1: *To improve conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of natural ecosystems*. The design of these components is aligned because the intended outcomes are primarily to improve the management of the priority wetland sites for better conservation for migratory

waterbirds and local biodiversity in general while allowing for more sustainable use of ecosystem services through NbS, supported by the strengthening of governance and capacity of the wetland stakeholders, and supplemented by knowledge building and sharing across the different sites.

Component 3 on Sustainable Financing is aligned to GEF-8 BD strategy Objective 3: *To increase mobilization of domestic resources for biodiversity*. Outputs under this component include designing of innovative financing mechanisms suitable to the respective contexts of the priority sites and with involvement of different partners including the private sector. Another output is to secure continuing budget allocations from the government to ensure sustainability and this will be supported by the policy interventions on wetlands in Component 2 on Governance.

2) BD-3 has been added in the PIF table

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 6/28/24:

Cleared

HF 5/21/24:

CBD Secretariat comments available under "Stakeholder comments" tab in the GEF Portal. I have also sent them via email.

Cross-walk of project and targets/how of KMGBF well noted and cleared.

HF 4/2/24

Alignment with KMGBF is only briefly addressed by indicating goal (ABD). Please see CBD Secretariat's specific comment, and please cross-walk the project outcomes and targets with the specific GBF targets.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

The narrative on alignment with KMGBF has been strengthened in a table in Part C of the PIF. However we are not privy to comments / feedback from CBD Secretariat in the Portal? An email was sent to the GEF program manager with request for clarification on 26 April 2024, but no response received. Please advise.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 5/21/24:

Cleared.

HF 4/2/24

Please provide further information on communities consulted/engaged or plans to do so. The project highlights the important role of local communities and indicates that it has consulted local communities in project design. The table in portal section, however, does not provide details of local communities consulted/engaged.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

Consultation meetings in Lake Mainit (17 February 2024) and Candaba (10 April 2024) are added in the PIF.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 4/2/24

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 6/28/24:

Yes, PM technically clears this MSP PIF. All technical and PO comments have been addressed.

HF 5/22/24:

No, not yet. Please revise per highlighted review comments and resubmit. Please continue to highlight changes/additions to text of PIF and annexes.

HF 4/2/24

No, not yet. Please revise per review comments and resubmit.

Agency's Comments

ADB 14 May 2024

PIF has been revised with highlighted sections (some narrative removed / changed also).

ADB 26 June 2024

Thank you.

ADB 03 July 2024

Highlights removed. Request has been submitted to World Bank ITS Portal support team to remove the 'letter on execution' from the Roadmap - which we hope will be done soon.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

HF 5/22/24:

- 1.) Policy Coherence: Please further develop mechanisms and activities to increase coherence among policies across sectors to support the conservation of these critical wetland sites and wildlife populations therein. In particular, please note the requirement under section C of the PIF to: "**Confirm if any country policies that might contradict with intended outcomes of the project have been identified, and how the project will address this.**" Please address this fully during PPG, incorporate into the project design and incorporate/highlight in in CER.
- 2.) Please clearly articulate the assumptions that form the basis of each causal pathway and are the key leverage points that need to be monitored and used for adaptive management and evaluated (for example: is the 'alternative' source of livelihood actually an alternative and resulting in decreased pressure on the wetland? if not, why not? how to adapt approach based on this to be more effective).
- 4.) For Agency consideration under Output 3.1, as part of the project's effort to consider opportunities for gender mainstreaming, is the WOCAN's W+ Standard (see: <https://www.wplus.org/>; <https://www.wplus.org/ssp/> and <https://www.wplus.org/era-brazil/>), which quantifies and monetizes women's empowerment in projects across six areas (time, income and assets, education and knowledge, leadership, food security and health), as one of the innovative mechanism.

Agency's Comments

ADB Response 02 July 2024

The Secretariat comments for additional items for consideration during CER preparation are duly noted.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/2/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/21/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/28/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/10/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		