



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

GEF ID:	5767		
Country/Region:	Philippines		
Project Title:	Implementation of SLM Practices to Address Land Degradation and Mitigate Effects of Drought		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5365 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$30,000	Project Grant:	\$870,900
Co-financing:	\$4,159,240	Total Project Cost:	\$5,060,140
PIF Approval:	May 09, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Johan Robinson

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> ?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated 01/22/2014.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	n/a	

\*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)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	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>	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	<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>	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
Project Design	<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>	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	03/24/2014 UA: No. a) The title of the project does not adequately reflect the proposed project objective, outcomes and outputs. The expected outputs are vague - they need to be more concise. b) The project would benefit from a stronger Investment focus with a clear link to field activities that create GEBs.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>c) The scale of the investment needs to be appropriate and significant (30 farming households is not an appropriate scale for a MSP).</p> <p>d) It is unclear how a "regular application of the LD-PMAT" could evidence reduced pressures on natural resources.</p> <p>e) The GEF grant should not be used to procure "equipment for training, laboratory analysis, etc." Please clarify.</p> <p>Please elaborate regarding the mentioned activity: "Provision of adequate financial incentives to promote greater uptake of SLM practices".</p> <p>04/22/2014 UA: All comments have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>03/24/2014 UA: Not fully - how will these GEBs be created?</p> <p>04/22/2014 UA: Comment has been adequately addressed.</p> <p>cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	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)	03/24/2014 UA: Yes. However, the social risk (adoption of SLM practices by small farmers) and the mitigation measure proposed should be a project focus and the mitigation measures built into the project concept.  04/22/2014 UA: Has been adequately addressed.  cleared	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	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>	03/24/2014 UA: Will be re-assessed after the project has been resubmitted.  04/22/2014 UA: Innovative element is the design of a gender sensitive approach to SLM programs from the outset of the project. Sustainability and replication is being considered within the institutional framework and in particular the sustainable financing mechanisms for natural resource management through realignment of public expenditure schemes and brokering additional funds for SLM.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
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?	<p>03/24/2014 UA: Will be re-assessed after the project has been resubmitted. In case the project will focus more strongly on the investive part, more funds might be required for component 2.</p> <p>04/22/2014 UA: The indicative budget has been revised.</p> <p>cleared</p>	
	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?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes.	
	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?	03/24/2014 UA: Yes. No deviation. The PPG is recommended for approval in line with PIF approval.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	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	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	03/24/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests made in this review.  04/22/2014 UA: Yes. All comments have been adequately addressed. The Program Manager recommends the PIF & PPG for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. <b>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)
	First review*	March 24, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 22, 2014	
	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.**