



**Philippines: Sustainable Management of Mt. Isarong's Territories  
(SUMMIT) Project (UNDP)**

Operational Program: 3,4 (Biodiversity)

GEF Secretariat Review: Endorsement

*Financing (millions):*    \$0.75                                      *Total (millions):*            \$2.23                                      1185

***Summary***

This project will assist CARE Philippines, the Government of Philippines and various sectors of society in addressing the long-term conservation and management of Mount Isarog, a key area of global importance within the Philippines under increasing human pressure. GEF catalytic support will contribute finances for three of five key topics contributing to completing outcomes outlined below.

*Expected Project Outputs:*    (a) stronger conservation management policy and practice, initiated and implemented through the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB), public and private organizations; (b) increased public understanding of Mount Isarog National Park (MINPs') value, and the impact of human behavior on its habitat and biodiversity; (c) increased environmental literacy, ethics and advocacy among MINPs' stakeholders; (d) measures to reduce pressures on MINP's habitat and biodiversity developed and implemented, and biodiversity conservation fund generated; (e) enhanced land tenure security among primary stakeholders.

*Project Duration (months):*    48

## Basic Project Data

Project GEF ID:

| <i>Staff</i>         |              | <i>Processing Status</i>           | <i>Date</i> |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Program Manager      | Ramos        | Processing Stage                   |             |
| Implementing Agency  | UNDP         | Concept Pipeline Discussion        |             |
| Regional Coordinator | T. Boyle     | PDF A - Agency Approval            |             |
| Executing Agency     | National NGO | PDF B - CEO Approval               |             |
|                      |              | Bilateral Project Review Meeting   |             |
|                      |              | Work Program Submission and Approv |             |
|                      |              | CEO Endorsement                    |             |
|                      |              | Agency Approval                    |             |
|                      |              | Project Completion                 |             |

## Cost Summary

| Cost Item                         | Years | Amount (USD'000) |
|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------|
| <u>Preparation</u>                |       |                  |
| - PDF A                           |       |                  |
| - PDF B                           |       |                  |
| - PDF C                           |       |                  |
| <u>Project Allocation</u>         |       |                  |
| - Executing Agency Fees and Costs |       | \$0.00           |
| - Project Management Costs        |       | \$0.00           |
| - Other Incremental Costs         |       | \$0.00           |

## Completeness of Documentation

|  |                                     |                     |                                     |                          |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Focal Point.....                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Budget.....         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Logical Framework.....   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| STAP Review.....                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Increment Cost..... | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Length.....              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Disclosure of Administration Cost..... | <input type="checkbox"/>            |                     |                                     | Complete Cover Sheet.... | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

## **1. Country Ownership**

### ***Country Eligibility***

The country ratified the CBD as recorded in the proposal. It is eligible for GEF support.

### ***Evidence of Country Ownership/Country-Drivenness***

Letter of endorsement, contribution to recurrent costs financing, past policy reform.

## **2. Program and Policy Conformity**

### ***Portfolio Balance***

Two GEF activities are underway in the country: an enabling activity and a large conservation of priority protected areas project. A few MSP are also under preparation. They do not address the specific site on this proposal.

Thematically, the proposal focuses on ICDPs. A recent review of ICDP experiences in Asia should provide useful lessons for this work

### ***Program Conformity***

Proposed activities conform well with OPs# 3 and 4.

### ***Replicability***

If project is successful, it has good potential for replicability. The proposal include actions to seek replicability in other parts of the country.

### ***Potential Global Environmental Benefits of Project***

Substantive, although the forested site is relatively small (around 10,000 ha)

### ***Sustainability***

A number of actions have been included to address institutional and financial sustainability, including: institution building, analysis of project needs to maintain an affordable scale of activities through self-financing, the establishment of a trust fund, etc. EU support will be critical as it would focus on key underlying causes of biodiversity loss.

### ***Baseline Course of Action***

Well defines, including a good analysis of threats and underlying problems.

### ***Alternative Action Supported by project***

The project is a bit optimistic about potential accomplishments, particularly in addressing underlying causes of biodiversity loss. Success of the project will partly depend on financial support from the EU, which would address some of the key underlying causes. The PM feels comfortable in recommending approval, as the proposal includes a letter of intent of the EU in approving the proposal under consideration. Indicators should be quantified. The PM is willing to send the proposal for review and endorsement under the understanding that UNDP will work with project proponents in revising the project brief to address this issue.

### ***Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy***

The proposal conforms well with GEF policy in this issue. It addresses well issues related to indigenous populations in the area. Indigenous peoples development programs will be structured as part of the project.

*Private Sector Involvement*

Issue not addressed in the proposal

**3. Appropriateness of GEF Financing**

*Incremental Cost*

Issue well addressed. GEF contribution would cover approximately 34% of total project costs. As indicated above, EU financing will be critical for the success of GEF interventions.

*Appropriateness of Financial Modality Proposed*

Grant resources requested.

*Financial Sustainability of the GEF-Funded Activity*

Issue well addressed in the proposal. There is a concern however, on the extensive dependence of international financing to keep the Philippines protected area program operating.

*Absorptive Capability*

Project proponents have apparently the capacity to handle this size of project.

*Cost Effectiveness*

**4. Coordination with Other Institutions**

*Collaboration*

Issue well addressed. It could be used as a best practice.

*Complementarity with Ongoing Activities*

Issue well addressed. It could be used as a best practice.

**5. Responsiveness to Comments and Evaluations**

*Core Commitments*

No financial resources from UNDP.

*Linkages*

The brief summary on page 5 should clearly describe UNDP's activities in the country and how these link to the current proposal. The description so far is very generic.

*Consultation and Coordination*

There is no reference to consultations conducted with World Bank. The project financed by GEF through the World Bank seems to be encountering problems during implementation. World Bank experience could be helpful to UNDP.

*Consistency w/previous upstream consultations, project preparation work, and processing conditions*

Project concept not previously seen.

***Monitoring & evaluation: Minimum GEF Standards, ME plan, proposed indicators, lessons from PIRs and Project Lessons Study***

M&E plan briefly described.

***Indicators***

Indicators should be quantified.

***Implementing Agencies' Comments***

None received to date.

***STAP Review***

None required.

***Council members' Comments***

None yet.

***Technical Assurances***

***Convention Secretariat***

None received yet.

***Other Technical Comments***

**Further Processing**

The Program Manager finds the proposal very well-written and conceptualized. It could be used as a best practice example, except for its length. The Program Manager recommends:

1. The project concept should be approved and included in the pipeline.
2. The project brief should be submitted for Council review.
3. The project brief will be send for CEO approval once a revised draft has been submitted which addresses the following issues:
  - (a) Project indicators should be quantified
  - (b) A fuller description of UNDP activities in country, particularly describing key projects or activities supporting this project;
  - (c) Take into account lessons from the Bank's review of ICDPs experience in Asia;
  - (d) Consultation with the Bank regarding the Protected Areas project on project implementation issues is key.