



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

GEF ID:	5549		
Country/Region:	Philippines		
Project Title:	"RicePlus" - Dynamic Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agro-biodiversity in Rice-based Farming Systems		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,182,631
Co-financing:	\$9,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,482,631
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Bjorn Conrad

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	08/26: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	08/26: Yes, in a letter dated August 13, 2013. In the letter, there is a discrepancy between the total amount requested in the table (\$2,499,481) and the total amount requested in the text (\$2,389,981). Please update accordingly.  08/30: Cleared.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	08/26: Yes, BD resources remaining to be allocated are \$6,633,340. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	08/26: Yes, see above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	08/26:N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	08/26:N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	08/26: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	08/26: N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>08/26: Yes, the project is well aligned with BD2 objective. Please, identify the Aichi targets that the project will help to achieve. Please, develop SMART indicators for each expected outcomes of Component 1 and 3. Target for each indicators will be defined for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>08/30: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	08/26: Yes, the project is consistent with country's national strategies, including NBSAP, the Philippines Development Plan, and the Act on agriculture. Cleared.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	08/26: Yes, the baseline is well prepared and provides an overview of the problem being addressed. Please, provide further detail of scale or magnitude regarding agriculture intensification, land use change and habitat loss. For example, how many indigenous/endemic variety are threatened of extinction; how much habitat is lost due agriculture	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>intensification? Detail on on-going related initiatives is provided, however, please, indicate the level of their investments.</p> <p>08/30: Please insert the quote from CHM into the document at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>08/26: The project design is clear and focused on few FA outcomes. As mentioned in Item 4, please develop SMART indicators for each expected outcomes. METT and the indicator's targets will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. The involvement of the private sector and supply chain actors is central for the achievement of project's objective, therefore, please provide more information on their involvement and the expected outcomes of these partnerships. Regarding the certification, please provide more information about the on-going initiatives and desmonstrate the added-value of GEF intervention. The criteria to select the pilot sites are well developed. Please specify the expected number of pilot sites and the superfcy. Sites and targeted species will have to be specified at CEO endorsement. Regarding the market development, please provide further detail or guarantee on market demand for these products.</p> <p>08/30: Sufficient information is provided at PIF stage. At CEO endorsement, further details are expected about the private sector engagement, guarantee on market demand. Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	08/26: Yes, the key GEB is the sustainable management of 30,000ha of National Important Agricultural Heritage Systems in line with national policy. Second is the creation of a market based incentive system to support agro-biodiversity conservation economically profitable for local communities.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	08/26: Local communities are the cornerstone of component 2. Information is provided on type of activities that will target them, but please provide further detail on their level of engagement in the project definition and implementation, the expected number of farmers involved, trained.  08/30: This is sufficient at PIF stage but further details are expected of how these groups will be engaged, trained (e.g number of farmers involved, how market will be secured, revenue generation). Cleared.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	08/26: Sufficient information provided at PIF stage. At CEO endorsement, please provide a fuller consideration of the potential risks and mitigation measure with regards to private sector involvement, coordination between ministries, as well as with local	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		institutions. Cleared.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/26: Yes, the project is consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives. Further details of how this coordination will be achieved are expected at CEO endorsement. Cleared.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	08/26: The support of in-situ conservation and sustainable use of indigenous varieties is innovative. The combination of pilot activities with corresponding policy development and mainstreaming will ensure the sustainability of this approach. The potential for scaling-up is good as these are only pilot sites, it could be replicated across the Philippines. Cleared.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B	08/26: yes, financing and cofinancing amounts are appropriate and adequate for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	the activities. Cleared.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	08/26: The cofinancing ratio is about 1:4.2; which is fine. It is indicated that APU and RIHN will provide cofinancing both in cash and in kind, please indicate for each of them, in a separate row, the respective amount in cash and in kind. Regarding the scope of the project, cofinancing from the private sector is encouraged. About 90% of the cofinancing is in kind, at CEO endorsement, more cofinancing in cash would be welcomed.  08/30: Cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	08/26: The Project Management Cost is at about 5%; which is fine. Cleared.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	08/26: Yes, PPG is approved. Cleared.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	08/26: N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	08/26: The project cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised in the above items.  08/30: The project is technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please consider the following items at CEO endorsement:  - Role of private sector in supply chain development and market demand. - Engagement with indigenous peoples, CSOs and local communities. - Risk and mitigation measures with regards to coordination within and between sectors and ministries. - Coordination with existing projects and activities. - Please fully examine the economic assumptions by the time of CEO endorsement. - Cofinance from private sector.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Approval	First review*	August 26, 2013	
Review Date (s)	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.**