



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

GEF ID:	4810		
Country/Region:	Philippines		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Marine Protected Area System to Conserve Marine Key Biodiversity Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4389 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,000,000
Co-financing:	\$37,627,717	Total Project Cost:	\$45,627,717
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Joseph D'Cruz

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	02/07/2012: yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	02/07/2012: yes, in a letter dated 31 January 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	02/07/2012: UNDP has a country office in Philippines. UNDP Philippines delivers around US\$15 million per year in overall development assistance and has a strong knowledge in PAs system.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	02/07/2012: NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	02/07/2012: The proposed project fits into the Agency's program (increase capacities of national and local	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		government officials and communities to conserve and sustainably manage the country's environment and maintain the ecosystem services of the natural resources). UNDP country office has 5 staffs in its Environment unit. Staffs in operation and financial management unit also support project implementation.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	02/07/2012: yes, the resources for the proposed grant are available under GEF-5 STAR.	
	• the focal area allocation?	02/07/2012: The focal area allocation is BD.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	02/07/2012: NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	02/07/2012: NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	02/07/2012: NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	02/07/2012: NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	02/07/2012: Yes, the project is well aligned with the GEF-5 Biodiversity strategy.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	02/07/2012: Yes, the proposed project will contribute to the objective 1 of the Biodiversity strategy in improving the management effectiveness of the existing and new PA and in increasing revenue for protected areas system.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and	02/07/2012: Yes, the proposed project has been identified as the first priority under the biodiversity component of the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	NPFE. The project will also contribute to the National Coastal Management program.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>02/07/2012: the proposed project will strengthen the technical skills and expertise at the MPAs and MPA system levels. It will provide support tools for use by local MPAs and Local Government Unit. But please give details on the people who will be trained, what agency they are from, ect. Please, provide more detailed information on the general topic of the trainings.</p> <p>03/05/2012: Addressed. We note that further information will be provided at PPG stage.</p>	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>02/07/2012: The baseline project provides interesting information. However, please better describe the threats with a focus on areas concerned by the project. A short brief on different type of fisheries, on pollution, logging, ect, is expected. The activities undertaken by the government are well described but please provide a short presentation of the major programs undertaken by NGOs, notably in partnership with LGUs.</p> <p>The baseline has to better develop the current MPAs status in Philippines (total number, total hectare, IUCN different categories) and the difficulties to harmonize the national and local strategies.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		03/05/2012: Information has been provided regarding the threats, the baseline project, and the barrier analysis and we noted that more details will be provided at the PPG phase.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	02/07/2012: yes, the project expects to strengthen the effectiveness of the MPAs system management and to ensure its sustainable funding. Furthermore, the close partnership which will be developed with the Local Government Units and the private sector will contribute to the biodiversity mainstreaming in both policies and sector development.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	02/07/2012: General comments: The project framework is sound well as it addresses the strengthening of the MPAs system management, the MPA financing and the policy harmonization however the expected outcomes seem ambitious and the relationship between the expected outputs and outcomes has to be described better. The capacity building at national and local levels has to be shown in the project framework. The field activities mobilizing at least 80% of the funding have to be highlighted. The picture of the current MPA management and the expected changes	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in the governance has to be better explained.</p> <p>Component 1: Please specify which IUCN category of MPA will be concerned by management improvement activities. The rational to develop new MPAs is clear however please specify the future status of these MPAs and if they will cover areas already protected by LGUs protected areas. Some clarification is required on the creation of a national MPA sub-system. Furthermore, how the national system for MPA identification and management will be set-up, under which body, and with which governance should be described. The METT has to be one of the indicators for this component.</p> <p>Component 2: The framework should better reflect the expected activities related to the national MPA system. Further details need to be provided on this system, showing the link between national, sub-national and MPAs levels. The strategies to increase revenue generation and to set-up ecological services payment have to be detailed.</p> <p>Component 3: Please, detail how the project will set-up the national mechanism for the selection and prioritization of MPA sites and how this mechanism will be implemented at the national, sub-national and local level.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>03/07/2012: Significant information has been provided on capacity building approach and on the field activities which will be developed. The expected outcomes and indicators are clearer and we note that they have been elaborated in consultation with the partners (could you please add this information in the PIF). However, because these outcomes are ambitious, at the PPG stage, more detailed information are expected on how they will be achieved, notably in further detailing the approach and its sustainability (for example, is the institutionalization of the PMU envisaged on the long term basis?).</p> <p>Component 1: Thank for the explanation provided, we note that the system for MPA identification and management and the governance mechanism employed will be further defined during the PPG formulation. Could you please insert the elements of your response in the PIF.</p> <p>Component 2: could you please check if the mentioned addition about the revenue generation strategies and the links between the various level have been added; the document received does not seem to include this update.</p> <p>Component 3: addressed</p> <p>03/15/2012: The issues have been addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	02/07/2012: yes	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	02/07/2012: preliminary information is given however please provide more details, supported by figures, on the expected economic benefits and the involvement of the local communities. 03/07/2012: Thank for the addition and we note that more specific information will be provided during the PPG phase.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	02/07/2012: Please, provide more information on the involvement of the CSOs and the LGUs at the national and sub-national levels and their identified roles. 03/07/2012: Addressed, however it is expected that during the PPG phase, more information about the involvement and coordination of all partners at the different levels will be provided.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	02/07/2012: yes, but it will have to be further developed by the time of CEO endorsement.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	02/07/2012: Conservation International Philippines, Haribon Foundation, WWF Philippines, FIN, RARE Philippines support the proposed project. Please provide more details on their respective programs to better show the synergies. Other related initiatives with very close objectives are presented. Please better	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>explain how the project will complement them and, highlight the project's added-value.</p> <p>03/07/2012: addressed.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>02/07/2012: Please, provide further details on the project implementation, on the governance and links between the national, sub-national and local levels. How the project will deal with the overlapping mandate between BFAR and PAWB? Which organization will host the PMU as it has been agreed that the PMU will not be from any organization of the partners?</p> <p>03/07/2012: Thank for the information provided concerning the overlapping mandate between BFAR and PAWB and on the preliminary agreement to house the PMU. We note that further analysis and consultation will be undertaken in order to provide a clear picture of the partners coordination. We understand that the LGUs will have a key role in this project, therefore detailed information will have to be provided at the PPG step on their involvement in the project governance.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	02/07/2012: the project management cost funded by the GEF is about 5%, which is good.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	02/07/2012: The current breakdown per component is relevant, with around 65% of the GEF budget allocated to component 1: MPA effective management. In the PIF, it is stated that at least 80% of the funding mobilized will be allocated for direct conservation activities on the ground.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	02/07/2012: The co-financing ratio is 1:4.7; which is good. The partnership with both NGOs and the government is a cornerstone of the project.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	02/07/2012: UNDP will provide US\$1 million of co-financing, which is in line with its role.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	02/07/2012: Please address the issues.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		03/07/2012: Please address the remaining issues and ensure that the elements of your response are well reflected in the PIF. 03/15/2012: The issues have been well addressed, therefore the PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	02/07/2012: Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the CEO endorsement: - Clear and measurable goals and objectives are defined - Co-financing is confirmed - Implementation arrangements with partners at the national and local levels (notably with LGUs) are well set-up - CSOs and private sector are well involved in the project implementation - GEF Tracking tools are included (Excel sheet METT+ Financial Sustainability Scorecard) - Strong evidence of global benefits is presented	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 08, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 15, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.