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

_____

GEF ID:	**5826**		
Country/Region:	**Philippines**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening National Systems to Improve Governance and Management of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Conserved Areas and Territories**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5389 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$1,751,484**
Co-financing:	**$5,025,239**	Total Project Cost:	**$6,776,723**
PIF Approval:	**May 21, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Nicole Glineur**	Agency Contact Person:	**Johan Robinson**

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**?	yes	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	yes	
	• the focal area allocation?	BD $1,751,484	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

*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 January 2013

1

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	Aichi Targets 11, 14 and 18	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	yes	
Project Design	6. 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?	Overall yes. This is a welcomed project. It is the 1st IP project in the Indo-Malay Pacific region which explores associated new governance regimes. The following would benefit from clarification and a map would be helpful 1. the text and Annex A refer to a considerable number of has which could significantly increase the protection coverage in PI yet the framework refers to CB in only 200,000 has . Please provide in the table and the GEB section the number of has that will be protected	The PIF mainly describes the current situation and does not describe clearly what the project will do and how it will do it. It will be important to develop the components at the next stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	under the project. 2.output 1.2 what is the status of the ICCA Bill? The text mentions it is being formulated. Will the output of the project be an approved final bill?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Overall OK at this stage	The PIF mainly describes the current situation and does not describe clearly what the project will do and how it will do it. It will be important to develop the components at the next stage. Although there is information in the PRODOC, under section A5, please briefly describe the 2 components and what, and how,they will achieve overall. July 20, 2015 Addressed.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	yes	Please add specifics at this stage
	9. 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?		Please add at this stage Yes
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	yes	yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)		yes
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	yes	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	yes	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		RF's outcome 1 was modified to reflect reduced expectations, however all efforts should be deployed to produce a joint memorandum circular during the project and promote coordination between departments. Please add this in section A5. This was reflected accordingly in the RF and budgetary allocation between components 1&2 were modified.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			July 20, 2015 Addressed.
	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?		yes
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	yes	It is noted that co-financing will be sought during implementation. Please reconcile table A's co-financing figure with that of table C July 20, 2015 Addressed.
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	yes	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	yes	yes
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the		please summarize PPG results in section A5 July 20, 2015 Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes As a result of PPG findings, the target increase in METT scores for PAs with documented and recognized ICCAs has been reduced from 20% to 10% since there majority of the criteria and assessment parameters in the METT are not directly relevant to ICCAs and the Project will have no significant interventions in the PA management which can result to an increase of 20%. Another indicator in the Project results framework was added to reflect its the target increase in METT for ICCAs from its current baseline to 10% by end of Project.
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		yes
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	5/2/14 Project will be recommended for technical clearance pending addressing of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		above comments. 5/20/14/ Comments have been addressed satisfactorily in the revised PIF. The PIF is technically cleared and recommended for approval	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please provide a summary of answers to GEF comments with re-submission	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		6/8/15. Please address comments July 20, 2015 Comments addressed. Recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		July 20, 2015
	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.**